



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Minorities and educational testing in schools in Arctic regions

An analysis and discussion focusing on normality, democracy, and inclusion for the cases of Greenland and the Swedish Sami schools

Andreasen, Karen Egedal; Kousholt, Kristine

Published in:
Testing and Inclusive Schooling

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Andreasen, K. E., & Kousholt, K. (2018). Minorities and educational testing in schools in Arctic regions: An analysis and discussion focusing on normality, democracy, and inclusion for the cases of Greenland and the Swedish Sami schools. In B. Hamre, A. Morin, & C. Ydesen (Eds.), *Testing and Inclusive Schooling: International Challenges and Opportunities* (1 ed., pp. 19-33). Routledge. Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education

TESTING AND INCLUSIVE SCHOOLING

INTERNATIONAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Edited by

Bjørn Hamre, Anne Morin and Christian Ydesen



Testing and Inclusive Schooling

Testing and Inclusive Schooling provides a comparative perspective on seemingly incompatible global agendas and efforts to include all children in the general school system, thus reducing exclusion. With an examination of the international testing culture and the politics of inclusion currently permeating national school reforms, this book raises a critical and constructive discussion of these movements, which appear to support one another, yet simultaneously offer profound contradictions.

With contributions from around the world, the book analyses the dilemma arising between reforms that urge schools to move towards a constantly higher academic level and those who practice a politics of inclusion, leading to a greater degree of student diversity. The book considers the types of problems that arise when reforms implemented at the international level are transformed into policies and practices, firmly placing global educational efforts into perspective by highlighting a range of different cases at both national and local levels.

Testing and Inclusive Schooling sheds light on new possibilities for educational improvements in global and local contexts and is essential reading for academics, researchers and postgraduate students interested in international and comparative education, assessment technologies and practices, inclusion, educational psychology and educational policy.

Bjørn Hamre is an Associate Professor in the Department of Education, Institute of Media, Cognition and Communication at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Anne Morin is an Associate Professor at the Danish School of Education, Aarhus University, Denmark.

Christian Ydesen is an Associate Professor in the Department of Learning and Philosophy, Aalborg University, Denmark.

Routledge Research in International and Comparative Education

This is a series that offers a global platform to engage scholars in continuous academic debate on key challenges and the latest thinking on issues in the fast-growing field of International and Comparative Education.

Titles in the series include:

Educational Choices, Aspirations and Transitions in Europe

Systemic, Institutional and Subjective Constraints

Edited by Aina Tarabini and Nicola Ingram

Cooperative Education in Asia

History, Present and Future Issues

Edited by Yasushi Tanaka

Testing and Inclusive Schooling

International Challenges and Opportunities

Edited by Bjørn Hamre, Anne Morin and Christian Ydesen

Vocational Education in the Nordic Countries

The Historical Evolution

Edited by Svein Michelsen and Marja-Leena Stenström

Vocational Education in the Nordic Countries

Learning from Diversity

Edited by Christian Helms Jørgensen, Ole Johnny Olsen and Daniel Persson Thunqvist

Higher Education and China's Global Rise

A Neo-tributary Perspective

Su-Yan Pan and Joe Tin-Yau Lo

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Routledge-Research-in-International-and-Comparative-Education/book-series/RRICE

Testing and Inclusive Schooling

International Challenges and
Opportunities

**Edited by Bjørn Hamre,
Anne Morin and
Christian Ydesen**

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Bjørn Hamre, Anne Morin and Christian Ydesen; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Bjørn Hamre, Anne Morin and Christian Ydesen to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-70148-9 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-20404-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

<i>Preface (editors)</i>	viii
<i>The tension field between testing and inclusion: introducing a research endeavour</i>	x
BJØRN HAMRE, ANNE MORIN, AND CHRISTIAN YDESEN	
SECTION I	
Testing and school reforms	1
1 Educational testing, the question of the public good, and room for inclusion: a comparative study of Scotland and the United States	3
CHRISTIAN YDESEN AND WAYNE AU	
2 Minorities and educational testing in schools in Arctic regions: an analysis and discussion focusing on normality, democracy, and inclusion for the cases of Greenland and the Swedish Sami schools	19
KAREN EGEDAL ANDREASEN AND KRISTINE BAGGE KOUSHOLT	
3 Educational opportunity between meritocracy and equity: a review of the National College Entrance Examination in China since 1977	34
YIHUAN ZOU	
4 The ‘problem’ of ‘quality’ schooling, national testing, and inclusion: Australian insights into policy and practice	47
IAN HARDY AND STUART WOODCOCK	
5 Standardized assessment and the shaping of neoliberal student subjectivities	64
PETER KELLY	

Section essay: ‘The banality of numbers’	79
STEPHEN J. BALL	
 SECTION II	
The agenda of inclusion	87
 6 Quality and inclusion in the SDGs: tension in principle and practice	89
WILLIAM C. SMITH	
 7 School reforms, market logic, and the politics of inclusion in the United States and Denmark	105
JESSICA HOLLOWAY AND BJØRN HAMRE	
 8 School development and inclusion in England and Germany	121
JULIE ALLAN AND TANJA STURM	
 9 Inclusion as a right and an obligation in a neoliberal society	135
JANNE HEDEGAARD HANSEN AND HALVOR BJØRNSRUD	
 10 Refugee education: conceptualizing inclusion amid conflict and crisis	152
NANETTE ARCHER SVENSON	
 Section essay: Testing inclusive education?	170
ROGER SLEE	
 SECTION III	
Inclusion and psychological assessment	181
 11 Inclusion: the Cinderella concept in educational policy in Latin America	182
EZEQUIEL GOMEZ CARIDE AND MAGDALENA CARDONER	
 12 Psychiatric testing and everyday school life: collaborative work with diagnosed children	198
ANNE MORIN AND LOTTE HEDEGAARD-SØRENSEN	

13 Development of a formative assessment system within a cross-cultural context (MANGO)	214
BRIAN ABERY AND RENÁTA TICHÁ	
14 The significance of SEN assessment, diagnoses, and psychometric tests in inclusive education: studies from Sweden and Germany	231
THOMAS BAROW AND DANIEL ÖSTLUND	
Section essay: Inclusion and assessment: complicated and complex	248
LANI FLORIAN	
Optimizing the educational subject between testing and inclusion in an era of neoliberalism: Musings on a research agenda and its future perspectives	254
BJØRN HAMRE, ANNE MORIN AND CHRISTIAN YDESEN	
<i>Index</i>	262
<i>About the authors</i>	267

Preface

The idea for this book first emerged from a collaboration between the editors, who shared an interest in what they saw as a field of tension between two powerful waves in contemporary education policy and practice, namely, those of inclusion and testing. Convinced of the idea's potential to bring together diverse research environments across the globe, we applied to the Danish Research Council for a transnational network on the topic. Unfortunately, the research council did not share our enthusiasm, and we had to proceed without funding network activities. However, since we were all in the privileged position of being tenured associate professors in Danish universities, we were able to find the necessary time and invoke our international contacts and networks to compile an international group of contributors, some from the field of testing research and others from the field of inclusion research but who all shared our drive to explore the field of tension further.

Apart from obtaining the actual contract with Routledge, the provisional peak in our research endeavour was the tripartite symposium at the European Conference for Educational Research (ECER) held in Copenhagen in August 2017. The symposium served to bring together most of the book's contributors and provided a space for the group to listen and comment on each other's chapters, which undoubtedly helped improve the book's coherence.

We are very grateful to a number of individuals and institutions for their support and assistance in helping us bring this volume to completion. We are most obviously indebted to our contributors, who not only produced their chapters within the required limits of time and length, but also supported this project in many important ways. We also want to extend special thanks to Dr Tim Corcoran from the School of Education, Deakin University, and to Professor Roger Slee from the School of Education, University of South Australia, for serving as discussants at our ECER symposium. At Routledge, we would especially like to acknowledge the work and assistance of our editor, Aiyana Curtis, and editorial assistant, Will Bateman. We are also thankful to AcademicWord for providing efficient and professional assistance in terms of copyediting the entire manuscript. We are grateful to Dr Jessica Holloway, Centre of Research for Educational Impact (REDI), Deakin University, for her assistance in copyediting

some of papers in the final process. We are tremendously grateful to Professor Annette Lorentsen, head of the Department of Learning and Philosophy at Aalborg University in Denmark, for supporting this project from beginning to end and, not least, for raising the funds to have the manuscript professionally copyedited before submission to Routledge.

Bjørn Hamre
Anne Morin
Christian Ydesen

The tension field between testing and inclusion

Introducing a research endeavour

Bjørn Hamre, Anne Morin, and Christian Ydesen

This book employs comparative and juxtaposing perspectives of seemingly different or perhaps even incompatible global agendas and efforts in education: on the one hand, what has been framed as the global testing culture (Smith, 2016), and, on the other hand, the global inclusive effort currently evident in the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals (Vladimirova & Le Blanc, 2016). Through 14 different chapter contributions discussing cases from all over the world, the book sets out to investigate the relations, dilemmas, and opportunities between the policies and practices of educational testing and calls of educational inclusion often associated with ideals of equality and democracy. The ambition of the book is, thus, to raise a critical, constructive discussion of these movements, which have been argued by some as supporting one another (Liebman & Sabel, 2003) but seemingly offering profound contradictions (Allan, 2015; Allan & Artiles, 2017; Slee, 2013).

The ideal of excellence and the ideal of diversity: caught under the same neoliberal umbrella?

Since 1994, when many countries ratified the renowned Salamanca Statement on social and educational inclusion, efforts have been made to include all children in general day care and school systems and thus reduce mechanisms of exclusion and the prominent role formerly ascribed to special needs education. This inclusive effort can be seen as linked to values of democracy and equality in society (Slee, 2011). However, this effort at inclusiveness faces constant challenges due to a general rise in exclusion and social inequality and increases in the numbers of refugee and minority children and students being diagnosed with mental disorders, along with a similar rise in the number of students referred to special needs education (Bucharadt, 2014; Harwood & Allan, 2014; McNeely et al., 2017; Padovan-Özdemir & Ydesen, 2016; Slee, 2013; Tomlinson, 2012). Such increases in student diversity and diagnoses implicating student referrals to alternate education paths are intimately connected to ubiquitous testing practices stemming from the practical application of international, national, and local testing and accountability programmes at different levels of education systems. These programmes range from psychological and psychiatric tests to

large international comparative testing schemes (e.g. the Organisation for Economic Collaboration and Development's Program for International Student Assessment). Different testing technologies thus influence educational practice and decision makers at all levels of the education anatomy (Andreasen, Rasmussen, & Ydesen, 2013; Pereyra, 2011). A key component of this influence arises through the constituting power and truth regimes instituted by tests because they influence decision makers' and professionals' understanding and actions, as well as shape student identities (Au, 2008; Bernstein, 1996). In turn, these power and truth regimes affect students' learning opportunities and trajectories, not least in terms of inclusion (Morin, 2015). This field of tension between testing and inclusion seems to point towards a dilemma between, on the one hand, ideals about accountability, assessment, and measurable levels of success, and, on the other hand, ambitions to create a school system that can support possibilities of participation and learning for all children.

The above-mentioned ambiguities are apparent at the policy level, as well as when these agendas are implemented in educational activities. Thus, in line with these ambiguities, this book analyses the dilemmas arising between school reforms that urge schools, teachers, and students to move towards a constantly higher academic level and those who call for a politics of inclusion, leading to a greater degree of student diversity in regular schools (Biesta, 2009). It is a dilemma that calls for new discussions and solutions by and among educational policy makers, researchers, school administrators, and teachers. In particular, these dilemmas underline a call for a discussion of the teacher's role, as well as the role of the various professionals cooperating in student assessment, learning, and development. The two discourses – one following an ideal of individual excellence in its aim to optimize and cultivate the performance of the individual student, and the other following the ideal of diversity, securing fair and easy access for all students in the educational environment – are contemporary historical constructions. We argue that these two discourses are current historical constructions expressing power relations that influence and define what education and schooling could and should be. The contributions in the volume present different cases of how these agendas of excellence and diversity relate to one another around the globe. As mentioned, the two discourses seem somehow contradictory in their different rationalities, as well as entangled in reforms, such as the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in the United States, which seemingly represent both the idea of excellence and that of diversity. This volume questions whether reforms such as NCLB and ESSA absorb both agendas under the umbrella of neoliberalism. By applying the term *neoliberalism* in education, we draw on some of the definitions fleshed out by Olssen, Codd, and O'Neill (2004, p. 138), stating, 'that subjects are economically self-interested, that competitiveness is a mechanism for quality and efficiency; that governments should rule from a distance through devolved management'. School reforms can thus be analysed as state-organized ways of turning students into educational subjects that aim to fulfil an agenda of accountability and marketization.

Norming and normalizing technologies: a poststructuralist approach to educational policy

On a theoretical level, we will present these agendas as historical phenomena inspired by the poststructuralism of Foucault and specifically draw on his distinction between *norming* and *normalizing* technologies of society, as analysed in his historical analysis of the emergence of the city (Foucault, 2009). According to Ball (2013), the historical development of the British schooling system can be analysed as a constant exchange between the norming and normalizing functions and technologies of the school. Historically, general education informed by politics has served a norming function in establishing how students are supposed to be and perform and which goals the school should follow to transfer these norms to educational practice and thus transform the students in accordance with the norms. Similarly, special needs education serves a normalizing function by presenting compensating technologies to reposition the problematics in accordance with the norm. Ball draws on Foucault's historical constructions of the *dispositive* in Foucault's (2009) analysis of this relation between the norming and normalizing functions of the school. In line with Foucault (1980), the *dispositive* is a historical construction that permeates discourses, practices, and institutions. This explains, for example, how school reforms not only appear at the discursive level of policy documents but also become embedded in institutions and practices and at the subject level. Serving a norming function discipline has a prescriptive function in the boundaries between desired and non-desired behaviours. Stating school standards is what educational politics have been about, and these standards thus work strategically in terms of the way norms are constructed in politics and schooling, legitimized by human and social sciences such as sociology, education, psychology, and psychiatry (Foucault, 1977, 2009). These norms are often legitimized through statements such as economic growth, 'what is needed for the future' (e.g. Bürgi, 2016), or relate to notions of the public good (e.g. Ydesen, 2016). Education policies can thus, in themselves, be seen as having a *norming* function, since education reforms express certain definitions of how students should behave. School reforms such as the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy in Australia clearly articulate norming as students performing better in reading or mathematics or 'using their full potential'.

Inclusion: promoting adaptable subjects?

Ball's analysis of the English school clearly shows that, historically, the school has always tried to handle diversity and deviancy in different ways (Ball, 2013). This is especially apparent in the historical role of special needs education, which has dealt with different subjects considered risky, deviant, or disabled. From this perspective, special needs education has served a normalizing function in defining that which deviates from the norm. The *dispositive* of security serves a normalizing function in relation to the population (Foucault, 2009).

Those excluded from society and the school may present a potential danger to society's cohesion. The welfare state thus draws on a range of security technologies aiming to anticipate the unexpected, thus serving to safeguard society through calculations to minimize risks. As seen in the historical role of special needs education, certain behaviours in society may be identified as dangerous or worrisome in order to launch interventions drawing on different technologies (Padovan-Özdemir & Ydesen, 2016). Thus, security measures take on the character of remedial technologies aimed towards the population in the welfare state. Whereas special needs education may have served such remedial technologies since at least the rise of the modern welfare state, the politics of inclusion seem to have increasingly taken over the normalizing functions of special needs education. Some of the contributions in this volume examine this shift in approach to students moving towards a more malleable subjectivity, adapting to the agenda of educational reforms that seeks to move the individual towards a trajectory of self-optimization, as well as striving to adapt to different educational settings in the era of inclusion. We question whether the politics of inclusion have overtaken the role of special needs education, since the adaptable subject of inclusion better fits the political era of neoliberalism and the neoliberal positioning of the subject as entrepreneurial (Olssen, Codd, & O'Neill, 2004, p. 136). This is one of the issues we will investigate and return to in the conclusion of the book.

In addition to our treatment of this main dilemma, the book also examines a second one arising between global agendas and local practices and solutions. What problematics arise when reforms springing from the international level are transformed into national and local policies and practices? By applying a global and comparative view to educational practices and solutions, the book aims to put global educational efforts into perspective by highlighting different cases at both the national and local levels. Overall, the book may be viewed as an argument for the need to discuss the discourses of the global accountability/assessment culture and the agenda of inclusion in a particular context, one that will frame new analyses of this context, as well as indicate new practices and solutions. The backbone of the book is thus an interdisciplinary global research collaboration consisting of researchers from all over the world investigating the relation between testing technologies and practices and the ideals of inclusion, equality, and democracy from an international perspective. By integrating these two agendas, we hope the book will shed light on new possibilities for educational improvements in global and local contexts.

The structure of the book

The book is structured into three main sections related to the thematic focus on testing and inclusion in policy and practice: Section I, 'Testing and school reforms'; Section II, 'The agenda of inclusion'; and Section III, 'Inclusion and psychological assessment'. The first section on testing and school reforms from a global perspective features five chapters. The section investigates and compares

testing practices in different countries, touching on such themes as democracy, the welfare state, minority education, access to education, discursive struggles, and the shaping of student subjectivities. Put together, the chapters of this section shed light on how the aforementioned discourse of *excellence* links with the features of the global testing culture – such as raising standards and promoting accountability – and how its movement into contingent national contexts has led to different manifestations in seven different national contexts (Australia, China, Greenland, Scotland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States), each positioned differently and with their own distinct idiosyncrasies in relation to the themes of the section.

Section II is concerned with the agenda of inclusion and sheds light on the dilemma between the criteria for student achievement, spurring the student to a constantly higher performance via a culture of testing, and the political discourse of *diversity and inclusion*, putting values of plurality, diversity, and participation in the foreground. In this section, the agenda of inclusion and the related ambivalences and challenges in the implementation of an inclusive school system are analysed from different theoretical and comparative perspectives involving tensions between global and local principles, structural barriers for realizing inclusion, new modes of governing in schooling, neoliberal logics, the marketization of teacher and student, and inclusion, which is seen as the student's individual responsibility.

While the two first sections thus analyse dilemmas of the political discourses of excellence and diversity, the final section, Section III, on inclusion and psychological assessment, traces the effects of assessment from the system level into concrete practices on the ground relating to the agenda of inclusion in classrooms. The purpose and use of assessment in local practices can be manifold, such as control, certification, legitimation, selection, differentiation, learning, and development. The use of assessment technologies and its results is therefore connected to educational practice, how issues of inclusion and exclusion are handled, and how the community of children, teachers, and other professionals works. Thereby, in this section, the chapters present a closer look into concrete practices and investigate the effects and meaning of testing as part of everyday school life with different consequences for different professionals and students in different positions.

Each section concludes with an essay by a high-profile researcher looking across the chapters of the section in terms of themes and perspectives and thereby adding a meta level to each section that will be followed up in the concluding chapter.

In Chapter 1, 'Educational testing, the question of the public good, and room for inclusion: A comparative study between Scotland and the United States', Wayne Au and Christian Ydesen, using a comparative study between Scotland and the United States, explore the relation between educational testing, the question of the public good, and room for inclusion by investigating the discourses and practices surrounding the launch of key educational testing schemes in the United States and Scotland. The chapter employs a comparative

methodological design to identify contrasts and recurrences to elucidate and amplify educational values and the implications in terms of educational inclusion. Chapter 2, 'Minorities and educational testing in schools in Arctic regions: An analysis and discussion focusing on normality, democracy, and inclusion for the cases of Greenland and the Swedish Sami schools', by Kristine Kousholt and Karen Andreassen, also employs a comparative perspective but focuses on Greenland and northern Sweden, where ethnic Inuit and ethnic Sami students, respectively, are identified as potentially problematic and subjected to practices reproducing social inequality in the tension field between testing, language, and the history of these minorities. In Chapter 3, 'Educational opportunity between meritocracy and equity: A review of the National College Entrance Examination in China since 1977', by Yihuan Zou, the different – but entangled – logics of meritocracy and equity are discussed in relation to a review of the evolution of the National College Entrance Examination in China since 1977. The analysis throws light on the role of market mechanisms working in parallel with strong state-directed interventions in distributing higher education opportunities in China's transitional economy. In Chapter 4, 'The "problem" of "quality" schooling, national testing, and inclusion: Australian insights into policy and practice', by Ian Hardy and Stuart Woodcock, the focus turns to the Australian continent. Drawing upon Bacchi's (2009) notion of the representation problem in policy analysis, this chapter describes how inclusion is constituted in schooling in Australia. In Chapter 5, 'Standardized assessment and the shaping of neoliberal student subjectivities', Peter Kelly ends the first section by focusing on the experiences of children in their final year of primary school in England, considering how standardized assessment shapes the curriculum and pedagogy and supports the formation of stratified neoliberal student subjectivities. It is argued that approaches invoked to improve students' test performances will neither help raise the grades of those identified as low-attaining beyond the mediocre nor have a positive impact on their reading outside of the tests. This first section ends with an essay by Stephen J. Ball, 'The banality of numbers'.

William C. Smith begins Section II with Chapter 6, 'Quality and inclusion in the SDGs: Tension in principle and practice'. The chapter explores the dilemma of primary school leaving exams in Uganda, where the Primary Leaving Exam creates different levels of exclusion, resulting in over 50% of exam takers in 2014 being denied access to government-funded secondary schools. Policy options are explored to overcome this conflict between inclusion and perceived quality in practice. In Chapter 7, 'School reforms, market logic, and the politics of inclusion in the United States and Denmark', Jessica Holloway and Bjørn Hamre compare parallel effects, ambivalences, and differences in the current inclusive efforts in educational politics in Denmark and the United States while relying specifically on a poststructural critique of policy. The authors argue that the policies in the two countries produce particular norms for how a student is 'supposed to be', which requires a disposition of optimization and a commitment to constant self-work to be more 'normal'. Julie Allan and Tanja Sturm investigate, in Chapter 8, 'School development and inclusion in England

and Germany', school development directed towards inclusion in England and Germany and the barriers to these efforts. The principal barriers arise, in both countries, from meeting the competing obligations of establishing an inclusive educational system and maximizing student attainment to compete effectively in a global economy.

Stating the argument that the welfare state in Western Europe underwent a wave of liberalization in the 1980s, Janne Hedegaard Hansen and Halvor Bjørnsrud, in Chapter 9, 'Inclusion as a right and obligation in a neoliberal society', compare policies in Norway and Denmark and show that, even though the two countries have different political strategies, they end up with the same problem: an inability to realize similar political educational goals in relation to inclusion. In Chapter 10, 'Refugee education: Conceptualizing inclusion amid conflict and crisis', Nanette Archer Svenson ends Section II by reviewing the present situation, where roughly 30 million young people are displaced and living under what can often best be described as extremely precarious conditions. The chapter places the discussion within the broader education inclusion discourse and focuses on the factors involved in refugee education globally. Section II ends with a section essay by Roger Slee, titled: 'Testing Inclusive Education?'

Section III starts with Chapter 11, 'Inclusion: The Cinderella concept in educational policy in Latin America', where Ezequiel Gomez Caride and Magdalena Cardoner analyse the discourse of the Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study in a Latin American context. The chapter explores how the framing and understanding of inclusion/exclusion arises in Latin American testing technologies. The chapter thus aims to track the ways in which the rationality that embraces inclusion and testing developed in Latin America. In Chapter 12, 'Psychiatric test knowledge and everyday school life: Collaborative work with diagnosed children', Anne Morin and Lotte Hedegaard-Sørensen discuss the two fields and practices of (neuro)psychiatric testing and inclusion in relation to each other. On the basis of an empirical case analysis, the chapter focuses on professional collaboration concerning diagnosed children, analysing how different interventions and procedures create certain conditions for the children's developmental and learning trajectories. To understand the reasons for professional decision making, dilemmas as well as developmental possibilities in the school system are explored, with a special focus on the different professional practices (e.g. teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists). Brian Abery and Renáta Tichá, in Chapter 13, 'Development of a formative assessment system within a cross-cultural context (MANGO)', explore the differences between summative and formative assessment and make the case for the latter, due to its direct relevance to instructional decision making and support of an inclusive approach to education. The discussion is based on a case study that describes the process through which a team of researchers from the United States and the Russian Federation developed a technology-supported approach to the formative assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities. Chapter 14, 'The significance of SEN assessment, diagnoses, and

psychometric tests in inclusive education: Studies from Sweden and Germany', by Thomas Barow and Daniel Östlund, analyses similarities and differences in SEN assessment from a Swedish – German perspective to shed insight on the relation between assessment and inclusive education. Their research findings contribute to a discussion on whether inclusive education can be based on a decategorized type of special education or whether it should promote the use of medical diagnoses and psychometrical tests. Section III concludes with an essay by Lani Florian, titled: 'Inclusion and Assessment: complicated and complex'.

References

- Allan, J. (2015). Waiting for inclusive education? An exploration of conceptual confusions and political struggles. In F. Kiuppis & R. S. Hausstätter (Eds.), *Inclusive education twenty years after Salamanca*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Allan, J., & Artiles, A. J. (Eds.). (2017). *World yearbook of education 2017: Assessment inequalities*. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Andreasen, K. E., Rasmussen, A., & Ydesen, C. (2013). Standardized testing. In J. Ainsworth (Ed.), *Sociology of education: An A-to-Z guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Au, W. W. (2008). Devising inequality: A Bernsteinian analysis of high stakes testing and social reproduction in education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 639–651.
- Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forests, NSW, Australia: Pearson.
- Ball, S. J. (2013). *Foucault, power, and education*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor Francis.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33–46. doi:10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9.
- Buchardt, M. (2014). *Pedagogized Muslimness religion and culture as identity politics in the classroom*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Bürgi, R. (2016). Systemic management of schools: The OECD's professionalisation and dissemination of output governance in the 1960s. *Paedagogica Historica*, 52(4), 408–422. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2016.1178780>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Pantheon: Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). The confession of the flesh. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972–1977)*. London & New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 194–228.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France 1982–1983*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harwood, V., & Allan, J. (2014). *Psychopathology at school: Theorizing mental disorders in education*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Liebman, J. S., & Sabel, C. F. (2003). The federal No Child Left Behind Act and the post-desegregation Civil Rights agenda. *North Carolina Law Review*, 81(4), 1703–1750.
- McNeely, C. A., Morland, L., Doty, S. B., Meschke, L. L., Awad, S., Husain, A., & Nashwan, A. (2017). How schools can promote healthy development for newly arrived immigrant and refugee adolescents: Research priorities. *Journal of School Health*, 87, 121–132. doi:10.1111/josh.12477

- Morin, A. (2015). Children's conduct of life – across general school, educational psychology consultation and psychiatry. *Nordic Psychology*, 67(3), 225–240.
- Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A.-M. (2004). *Education policy: Globalisation, citizenship, democracy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Padovan-Özdemir, M., & Ydesen, C. (2016). Professional encounters with the post-WWII immigrant: A privileged prism for studying the shaping of European welfare nation-states. *Paedagogica Historica*, 52(5), 423–437. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2016.1211156>
- Pereyra, M. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Pisa under examination: Changing knowledge, changing tests and changing schools*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. Wiltshire: Routledge.
- Slee, R. (2013). Meeting some challenges of inclusive education in an age of exclusion. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(2), 3–17.
- Smith, W. C. (Ed.). (2016). *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Tomlinson, S. (2012). The irresistible rise of the SEN industry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(3), 267–286.
- Vladimirova, K., & Le Blanc, D. (2016). Exploring links between education and sustainable development goals through the lens of UN flagship reports. *Sustainable Development*, 24, 254–271. doi:10.1002/sd.1626
- Ydesen, C. (2016). Crafting the English welfare state-interventions by Birmingham local education authorities, 1948–1963. *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(4), 614–630. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3223>

Section I

Testing and school reforms



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

1 Educational testing, the question of the public good, and room for inclusion

A comparative study of Scotland and the United States

Christian Ydesen and Wayne Au

Introduction

Testing is a technological tool that cannot be treated in isolation from society at large along with the attendant questions of power, education access, education management, and social selection (Au, 2008; Ydesen, 2011). Several sociologists have argued that modern societies, in keeping with the increased division of labour, are dependent on some form of selection system able to establish criteria of human worth and the corresponding social positions they should fill (e.g. Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Weber, 2009). In a democratic society, such a selection system is legitimized in terms of objectivity, fairness, and justness (Ydesen, 2014). Testing is as endemic as ever (Connell, 2013; Lindblad, Pettersson, & Popkewitz, 2015), and it employs the language of science (numbers and statistics), rendering the perception that testing is credible, fair, impartial, authoritative, valid, and precise (Dorn, 2007; Hansen & Porter, 2012; Hopmann, 2007).

Despite critical research on educational testing pointing out the inadequacies, inconsistencies, and unjust nature of many educational testing practices (e.g. Au, 2008, 2010; Madaus, Russell, & Higgins, 2009; Nichols & Berliner, 2007), testing is still closely linked with imaginaries of the public good. Drawing on a Bourdieusian concept of state, the public good can be understood as a justifying referent for governing (Arnholtz & Hammerslev, 2013, p. 54; Bourdieu, 2014), where the public good is understood as a key repository or reservoir for justifications and legitimations of professional interventions, such as launching a national testing scheme (Ydesen, 2016, p. 617). In other words, a testing practice must be accompanied by a positive discourse about the benefits of the selection practice in terms of improvements and gains for society and the individual; otherwise, the practice will be void of legitimacy and lose credibility. Therefore, using educational testing discourses and practices as entries to understanding the imaginaries of the public good is of scholarly interest because it contributes knowledge about inherent educational values, which, again, frame educational conditions and have implications in terms of inclusion,

that is, who can be a legitimate participant in education. This chapter uses the cases of both the United States and Scotland to explore this phenomenon because, as we shall argue, despite their differing historical trajectories, both cases illustrate how testing is framed around a discourse of social inclusion and what Depaepe and Smeyers (2008) have called the educationalization of social problems. This means that the education system is being held accountable for solving all sorts of social problems. In fact, every social challenge facing contemporary society – such as social cohesion, inequality, attainments gaps – has an unmistakable educational component.

Case studies, methodology, and chapter structure

In this chapter, we investigate the discourses and practices surrounding the launch of key educational testing schemes in the United States and Scotland. The chapter employs a comparative methodological design to identify contrasts and patterns for elucidating and amplifying educational values and the implications in terms of educational inclusion. The sources are research literature, policy documents, newspaper articles, and reports.

In the United States, the discourse around educational testing and the public good has largely revolved around the use of testing to promote race equality, with special attention to testing as a ‘civil rights issue’ that will ameliorate racial inequality in public education (e.g. Brooks, 2014; Brown, 2015). Civil rights framing in educational testing in the United States began as part of the discourse surrounding the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001 and has continued as a driving discourse for the use of educational testing to improve schools and hold educators accountable for increasing the test-based achievement of non-white students (Au, 2009b). By proxy, the idea is that such testing is a public good because, according to its proponents, it creates more opportunities for students who have been systematically disadvantaged.

Scotland is in the process of introducing national tests in its educational system. They are a key feature of the National Improvement Framework, which the Scottish government claims will help narrow the attainment gap between the least and most deprived children. In this respect, the main argument for introducing the tests can be interpreted as an issue of eradicating class differences and creating an inclusive education system. It is noteworthy that proponents of the testing program claim that it will steer clear of the damaging teaching to the test, target setting, and league table agenda prevalent in England (British Broadcasting Corporation, or BBC, 2016a; Scottish Government, 2015a).

The chapter is structured accordingly. The first section investigates the US case, and the second section focuses on the Scottish case. The concluding discussion analyses the contrasts and similarities between the cases in terms of the educational values in evidence and puts the findings into perspective in terms of inclusive education.

Testing as a public good in the United States

For over 100 years, in the United States, forms of standardized testing have been promoted as a public good (Reese, 2013). For instance, in the early 1900s, despite deep cultural and class biases, such testing became the basis for setting students onto different educational tracks according to test scores. It was argued that such differentiation was a public good because it played into a dominant public discourse of efficiency in production and in schools, particularly relative to the social and economic ‘crises’ of sharp poverty, an increasing immigrant population, and the need to organize schooling for masses of children (Au, 2009c).

Standardized testing was once again presented as a public good in the United States in response to the then USSR’s launching of the Sputnik satellite in 1957, as well as later, in 1983, during the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. In both cases, the crises constructed through Cold War competition provided the impetus for increased standards and testing in federal US education reform efforts (Kornhaber & Orfield, 2001; Madaus, Russell, & Higgins, 2009, p. 16f.).

The current framing of standardized educational testing as a public good in the United States spans three policies and programs: the 2002 NCLB reauthorization of the federal US Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Obama administration’s Race to the Top initiative, and the 2016 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reauthorization of the federal US Elementary and Secondary Education Act. NCLB in particular was built around a crisis of racial disparities in educational achievement, especially as measured by standardized educational test scores (Darling-Hammond, 2007). As such, within this context, such testing has been advanced as a public good for diminishing racism in education, drawing explicitly on the legacy of the United States’ racial civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

Testing, civil rights, and the discourse of race equity

Public education reform in the United States has always been connected to social projects connected to race and racism, but this relation was cemented with the *Brown v. Board of Education* case and ruling in 1954. The *Brown* decision linked struggles over racial desegregation in the United States with school desegregation policy and practice, because it determined that separate schools for racial groups could not be considered equal, thus beginning the forced racial desegregation of schools in the United States (Baker, Myers, & Vasquez, 2014).

Beginning with NCLB (Darling-Hammond, 2007; Hursh, 2007), policy makers and non-governmental organizations have thus summoned the legacy of the racial civil rights movement as a key justification for education policy reforms built upon a foundation of standardized educational testing, a justification itself built upon the assertion of educational testing as a public good. Indeed, as Rhodes (2011) argues, mainstream civil rights organizations played

pivotal roles in pushing for educational testing and passing NCLB and similar policies into law, which Crawford (2007) notes also corresponded with a shift in defining educational civil rights in terms of test-based outputs instead of access to educational resources.

There are many examples of politicians and dignitaries mustering the language of the US civil rights movement relative to educational inequality, all voiced in support of standardized educational test-based policies. For instance, speaking around the time of NCLB's passage into law in 2002, then-US president George W. Bush asserted that 'education is the great Civil Rights issue of our time' (CNN, 2002, n.p.). At the time, legal analysts suggested that the educational test-based accountability policies of NCLB would give the civil rights movement a 'second chance' to fight for the civil rights of educational outcomes (Liebman & Sabel, 2003), arguing that the tests provided a basis for determining adequate education for racial groups. Other state officials under the administrations of both US presidents Bush and Obama specifically evoked the language of civil rights in connection to testing (Au, 2009b; Feinberg, 2004; Hursh, 2007; Paige, 2006; Resmovits, 2014).

Little changed in US federal education policy when the ESSA was signed into law in December 2015, since it relied on high-stakes testing as the key mechanism for leveraging educational equality and improvement (Karp, 2016). Even though anti-testing activists were successful enough that ESSA included language on parents' rights to opt their children out of tests if they so choose, the law still requires that 95 percent of eligible students take the tests, thereby undercutting resistance efforts and maintaining a reliance on high-stakes testing (Au, 2016; Au & Hollar, 2016). Further, mainstream civil rights organizations have continually opposed grassroots movements against standardized educational testing (Brown, 2015; Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, 2015) on the presumption that such testing, as a public good, facilitates racial equality (see also Au, 2015a; Hagopian & Network for Public Education, 2015).

US testing fails the race equity test

The assertion that using high-stakes tests will serve the public good by improving race equity in US schools is empirically testable, and the data tell us that this focus on testing not only has not improved race equity in schools, but has also damaged the education of non-white children. For instance, the United States has essentially required national high-stakes testing since 2002, and, since then, test score gaps between white and non-white students have increased (Lee, 2006; National Research Council, 2011; Ravitch, 2013).

Research has also found that the impact of high-stakes testing on US classrooms has denigrated the quality of education for non-white students in particular; these students end up experiencing the greatest restrictions in curriculum and pedagogy, since teachers of children of colour focus more on test preparation and less on enriching educational experiences (Au, 2009a;

Nichols & Berliner, 2007). The negative, disparate impact of high-stakes testing on non-white children in the United States is also illustrated through the effects of high school exit exams. It is well established in the research that such exit exams generally fail non-white students at disproportionate rates (Zabala, 2007). These negative effects are compounded by research that has found a correlation between such exams and a 12.5 percent increase in the rate of incarceration (Baker & Lang, 2013), suggesting that such tests contribute directly to the school-to-prison pipeline for African American and Latino youth in the United States.

The enduring discourse of testing as a public good

Given that the rhetorical claims surrounding high-stakes testing in the United States as a public good in the service of racial equality and civil rights are directly contradicted by the empirical evidence, it is important to consider how and why such testing remains at the centre of reforms efforts there. One aspect of testing's persistence is part technological, part ideological, and part historical: the presumed objectivity of the tool of standardized testing as a technology to measure human intelligence and learning has directly contributed to the maintenance of the ideology of meritocracy. That is, if the tests are presumed to function as objective measures, then they are also presumed to provide pure measures of student effort, with individual merit and hard work being what determines test scores. Historically, this ideology has been used to deny structural constraints facing non-white communities (e.g. racism or lack of access to resources), effectively justifying the existing educational and social order (Au, 2009c; Bowles & Gintis, 1976). In the case of the United States, the framing of high-stakes testing as a public good for racial equality has thus been used to pivot conversations and policy away from substantial community reforms such as affordable housing and universal healthcare and created a laser-like focus on school reform as the central mechanism for challenging racism.

Further, there is an economic aspect to the persistence of testing and using civil rights and racial equity to frame it as a public good. The entire K–12 education market in the United States has been estimated by some analysts at over US\$700 billion. This large market has attracted major corporations, business leaders, and entrepreneurs eager to seek profits as policymakers in the United States have become increasingly aligned with the principles of free market and neoliberalism for public institutions, including education. High-stakes testing, with its inherent ability to produce numerical data to make comparisons, is central to the neoliberal project of the financialization of public education because it facilitates the creation of quasi-markets of educational performance (Au & Hollar, 2016). The framing of high-stakes testing as a public good in the service of racial equity functionally provides ideological cover for educational reforms and neoliberal policies that fundamentally hurt non-white children and their communities (Au, 2015b).

As the above discussion suggests, high-stakes standardized testing in the United States raises significant issues regarding inclusion in education. Such testing has shaped the content of the curriculum and the forms of classroom instruction with which students engage. The control of content and delivery holds strong implications for whether or not students see themselves reflected in the classroom. This means the tests create an immediate gatekeeper with regards to whose knowledge and identities are considered allowable in classroom discourse and whose are not, making them a filter and arbiter of acceptable and unacceptable student identities and epistemologies (Au, 2008, 2009a). High-stakes standardized testing thus fundamentally acts as a mechanism for the exclusion of student diversity at the cost of inclusion for all students. The question remains as to whether or not Scotland, with its new testing program, will learn from the negative example of the United States.

Testing in Scotland

In September 2015, First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, leader of the Scottish National Party (SNP) government, announced the introduction of national standardized testing in Scottish schools in 2017 (BBC, 2015). The new national testing scheme is part and parcel of the National Improvement Framework for Scottish education, a comprehensive package of programs launched by the government to improve Scottish education and coordinated by Education Scotland, a new national improvement agency for education established in 2011 that incorporates the curriculum agency and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (Scottish Government, 2011, 2016a, p. 3). In a wider political sense, the National Improvement Framework may be viewed as a core feature of the SNP's political ambition to strengthen national identity through improving education performance and thus perhaps – in due time – contribute to the political goal of gaining independence from the United Kingdom (Arnott & Ozga, 2010, p. 337).

From a historical perspective, however, educational testing has a mixed history in Scottish education policies ever since professor Godfrey Thomson (1881–1955) created the Moray House intelligence tests in the interwar years, arguing for their ability to create equal opportunities for every child (Lawn & Deary, 2014). In the early 1990s, national tests were introduced. According to Hayward and Hutchinson (2005, p. 229), the tests were designed to 'provide teachers with the means to check their own assessments . . . and should ensure more consistent interpretation by teachers of what particular levels of attainment mean'. However, as argued by Hayward and Hutchinson, testing in Scotland soon became high stakes because teachers did not challenge the test results. The reason teachers acted against policy and tests came to be seen as a proxy for teachers' professional judgement.

An important rupture in the history of Scottish education is undoubtedly the re-establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, which meant that education policy began to break away from the UK government's pro-testing line

(Ozga, 2011). It was important for the new government to demonstrate independent policy making and favour the oppositional stance of parents and teachers towards educational testing. In 2003, national testing was officially scrapped.

The initiative was the result of a national debate on education launched by the Scottish Government in 2002 in response to public perceptions that ‘standards were falling and that Scotland was in danger of falling behind other countries in terms of a skilled workforce and economic competitiveness’ (Hayward & Hutchinson, 2013, p. 54). However, in line with the political ambitions of the new government – but contrary to what was going on in many other countries, where Programme for International Student Assessment shocks reverberated – the insight emerging from the debate was not the advancement of further testing but, rather, that testing seemed to inhibit ‘deeper learning’ because teachers were prone to only focus on the curriculum and the measurement of progress (Hayward & Hutchinson, 2013).

Public debates: national testing or national assessments?

In congruence with the critical stance towards testing taken by many educators and stakeholders of education in Scotland, the first minister’s announcement in 2015 was met with severe opposition. Brian Boyd, Emeritus Professor of Education at Strathclyde University, described the plans as ‘at best a disappointment and at worst a retrograde step which will simply serve to worsen the problem’ (McEnaney, 2016). On the same note, teachers raised concerns about league tables, washback effects, and the undermining of pupils’ deeper understanding of subjects, while the Scottish Parent Teacher Council stated that many parents were uncertain about how the data might best be used (McIvor, 2016). In these debates, England – where educational testing has always been more popular because of the widespread existence of school choice and the stronger promotion of competition between schools than in Scotland – was often used as an example of what not to do (e.g. Educational Institute of Scotland, 2015; Herald Scotland, 2016; Ozga, 2011).

In response to these criticisms, the government avoided the phrase *national testing* and stressed that the new *assessments* would not be comparable to those taken south of the border (BBC, 2016b). The first minister argued that ‘this is not about narrowing the curriculum or forcing teachers to teach to the test. It is not a return to the national testing of old’ (BBC, 2015). Education Secretary John Swinney described the tests as ‘not educational’ (BBC, 2016b) and insisted that the new national assessments would neither create extra work for teachers or children nor be high stakes in any way. Rather, the education secretary argued,

The standardised assessments will be an important tool for teachers, who will have an additional source of nationally consistent evidence about how well pupils are progressing. They will be able to draw on this alongside other assessment information to help inform their professional judgement,

which is how we evaluate whether children have achieved the relevant Curriculum for Excellence levels for their stage.

(Edinburgh News, 2016)

If anything, the debates over the new national testing – or assessment – scheme show a rather acrimonious exchange of views – rooted in the history of education – indicating fierce discursive negotiations over terminology. Using the term *testing* seems to invoke fears that the English educational testing regime would flow over the border and contaminate the Scottish way of education. In this understanding, testing is by no means a public good; in fact, testing is even incompatible with imaginaries of the public good, since it is a Pandora's box type of tool for governing that will essentially stymie social equity and progress in society.

Obviously, the government holds a very different view, arguing that the national assessment scheme only serves the role of a humble tool that will provide genuine progress for Scottish education, with positive implications for both the individual child and society as a whole. It is, however, remarkable that both sides of the debate seem to share ideas about the public good, such as social equity and children's ability to succeed. It may seem like a paradox, but the big bone of contention is precisely the testing scheme and its spin-off effects on education.

The Scottish government's reasoning

The official and overall aim of the new national testing scheme is to raise attainment amongst schoolchildren and close the poverty-related attainment gap, based on reliable data (BBC, 2015; McEnaney, 2016). However, from a government perspective, the new testing scheme plays a role on several levels: 1) the macro level (knowing the overall performance of the education system and the size of the attainment gap), 2) the meso level (knowing the performance of each region and each school), and 3) the micro level (knowing the performance of each individual child).

Looking first at the macro level, the government's argument is that 'this new system will . . . help to reduce the burden of assessment, building on best practice and replacing the wide variety of approaches taken by local authorities with a new streamlined, consistent approach' (Scottish Government, 2015b). The new system is, in this sense, about standardizing the output measures of the Scottish education system and avoiding idiosyncrasies inhibiting the comparability and transparency of the system. The aim of this standardization is the identified 'need to know the size of the attainment gap at different ages and stages, across Scotland, in order to take the right action to close it' (Scottish Government, 2016a, p. 16, 2016b).

Moving to the meso level, the government argues that the new testing scheme 'will help us to identify where we are doing well and which practices and interventions are having an impact. It will also help us to identify areas

where, collectively we need to do more' (Scottish Government, 2016a, p. 16). The reasoning of this argument is built on the condition that regions, local councils, and individual schools can be compared in light of the political goal of closing the attainment gap; it is about acquiring knowledge through comparable data for making justified professional interventions. As argued in the 2016 government report, the new framework 'will provide a level of robust, consistent and transparent data across Scotland that we have never had before' (Scottish Government, 2016a, p. 5).

Finally, at the micro level, the government's main goals are that Scottish children should become successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors, and responsible citizens (Scottish Government, 2016a, p. 2). These goals feature both economic and civic purposes of education. Overall, education seems to serve a dual purpose: 1) to improve children's well-being and ability to succeed and 2) to contribute to a more successful country with increasing sustainable economic growth (Scottish Government, 2016a). In that sense, the Scottish government is attempting to strike a balance between the considerations of the child and of society. As argued by Arnott and Ozga (2010), the Scottish government, in its education policies, seeks to invoke 'modernized nationalism,' understood as non-exclusive and comprised of fluid, contingent, and processual elements, as the central cog for striking a balance between considerations of economic growth and considerations of community, fairness, and inclusiveness. In this endeavour, the Scottish government supports teacher curricular autonomy while strengthening inspection and the production of data. This cocktail is seen as being able to secure better outcomes for poor children.

In terms of the public good, the new national testing scheme is a reflection of a social inclusion agenda and meritocratic egalitarianism; everyone should be able to take part in society as best they can to the benefit of society and the individual, in perfect harmony. The other side of the coin, however, is that testing is also a tool for detecting particular kinds of deviance, justifying professional intervention. In that light, the creation of test data is a form of governing aiming to make sure that people live not just any type of life, but a particular type of life centred on educational advancement and societal usefulness. Testing is, in that sense, a 'normalization' process. In that governing process, even parents are enrolled as the prolonged arms of the state to further advance the normalization process in the home. In its 2016 report, the Scottish government (2016a, p. 5) argues that

Parents will be able to access information from teacher's professional judgement and the underlying standardised assessment data about their own child's learning, providing valuable, nationally consistent information about children's progress and signalling where further support may be required at home and in school.

This Janus-faced view of educational testing is, to some extent, precisely what is reflected in the public debates analysed above, but it is also a very clear

expression of the educationalization of social problems. On the same note, the Scottish government report (2016a, p. 2) clearly outlines how ‘achieving improvement in education is closely related to achieving other key National Outcomes in the National Performance Framework’ and argues that ‘as a core part of our drive to achieve fairer outcomes for our children and young people, we know that investing in their education is essential to achieving their aspirations and our ambitions as a country’.

Given these analytical insights, the next paragraph takes a closer look at some of the very methodological assumptions behind the national testing scheme to further uncover the implications in terms of educational inclusion.

The national testing scheme

As noted above, the new testing scheme is assumed by the Scottish government to encompass the ability to diagnose children in relation to the learning goals of the Curriculum for Excellence. Although little is publicly known about the actual test items comprising the new Scottish test battery, a number of core characteristics are known: They are online, adaptive, and marked online; there is no pass or fail cut score; and the items are not used for making official league tables.

A closer look reveals that the National Improvement Framework is based on the 2015 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report ‘Improving Schools in Scotland: An OECD Perspective’; a what-works and best-practice approach as defined by the OECD; and, not least, the ‘Synergies for Better Learning: An International Perspective on Evaluation and Assessment’ publication from 2013. The 2015 OECD report (p. 11) states that the current Scottish assessment system does not provide sufficiently robust information for policymakers, councils, schools, or teachers.

The Scottish government report, however, demonstrates no engagement – or quality check – with the political agendas and values inherent in the OECD reports to reflect an evidence-based and best-practice regime. The government only notes that the reform framework ‘is designed to address one of the key issues identified by the OECD, the need to develop an integrated framework for assessment and evaluation that encompasses all system levels and ensures all partners are focused effectively on key priorities’ (Scottish Government, 2016a, p. 5).

To reach its conclusions, the OECD (2015, p. 50) ‘put Scotland into its international context on diverse measures relating to both quality and equity’. This means the OECD has reviewed ‘international evidence and compares Scotland with certain other systems – especially, with Canada, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway’ (p. 49). Thus, the OECD and the government’s new international council of educational advisers serve as pundits for the National Improvement Framework in education (Scottish Government, 2016b, p. 1). Many, but not all, of these advisers are, incidentally, associated with the OECD, the Ontario school system, and an evidence-based and what-works approach

to educational reform. In that sense, there is a link with what has been termed the global testing culture (Smith, 2016), but its outlet is distinctly Scottish, in that the Scottish government frequently refers to fairness and action on poverty.

Given the above, the new Scottish testing scheme may be described as closely linked with a positivist and measurable ontology utilized to achieve efficiency and the productive use of all available human resources. Together with the social inclusion agenda and meritocratic egalitarian ideals, these observations are also features of the public good in the Scottish case. However, they must be understood in congruence with the modernized nationalism outlined above, the point of gravity being ‘outward referencing’, placing Scotland as a member of a community of Nordic countries (the Scandinavian and Baltic countries), and ‘inward referencing’ to historically embedded popular narratives of fairness (Arnott & Ozga, 2010).

Conclusions

Even though the United States and Scotland are different – not least in terms of their history – a number of contrasts and patterns present themselves across the two cases. What we have framed as the educationalization of social problems rooted in concerns about social inclusion and an ideology of meritocracy is consistent across both countries, at least at the discursive level. Social inclusion and meritocracy are central in terms of describing the public good of education in general and educational testing in particular. However, while social inclusion and meritocracy focus more on racial inequalities in the United States and less on economic class, from the onset, the Scottish case displays a clear concern with poverty and socially disadvantaged children.

Empirically, the two cases are very different. As we have argued, the United States has a long history of high-stakes testing, while Scotland is a relative newcomer to the field; that is, educational testing has long been an ambiguous tool in Scottish education, not least because of national sentiments calling for clear demarcations from England.

In the US case, the empirical evidence indicates that the use of educational testing to diminish social and racial inequalities is problematic in terms of the inclusion agenda. The main reasons are that arguments of social and racial equality are ahistorical, because they do not recognize how such testing has been used against non-white and socially disadvantaged communities and students. The arguments are not technically sound because they do not account for the role of standardized testing in constructing the very inequalities proponents claim the tests will diminish. They are not based in empirical research, which has consistently found that such testing has not increased achievement and, instead, has functioned to worsen the educational experiences of non-white and socially disadvantaged children. Finally, the arguments lack understanding of the use of standardized educational testing as a tool for neoliberal reformers to undermine and attack the very concept of the public good and reshape institutions and policies along the lines of private markets.

In Scotland, the national testing scheme has not yet been rolled out, and, so, there is no empirical evidence upon which we can base our conclusions in terms of practical implications. However, our analysis of the policies and discursive arguments – and comparing with the US experience – raise awareness that the new Scottish testing scheme may have unintended consequences that will work contrary to the ideals of meritocracy and social inclusion. Indeed, if the US case can offer any lesson for the Scottish case, it is that standardized testing can be used by governments to obscure structural inequalities beneath a veneer of meritocratic competition and tropes of individuals' hard work. Quite often, the empirical practices of testing differ from the drawing board theories about testing and what it does to education. Attempting to tame the educational testing tool to serve political ambitions at the macro, meso, and micro levels may prove to be an ill-advised exercise that deepens social disadvantages rather than heals them.

However, while the values of the public good seem to be a shared experience of the two case countries, the political priorities seem to differ. Scotland is oriented towards traditional social democratic welfare state values, arguing its links and commonalities with the Scandinavian and Baltic states. The United States, on the other hand, has largely embraced the neoliberal economic and social paradigm, which has meant the continual erosion of structural state support for social well-being in favour of market mechanisms. Consequently, the United States is currently seeing the sharpest income disparities in almost 100 years, and the evidence indicates that its system of education, including high-stakes testing, cannot overcome such stark socioeconomic inequality. There is thus a stark contrast between Scotland's framing of what counts as a public good (more social support) versus that of the United States (less social support), and this difference will hopefully place the new Scottish testing scheme on a better trajectory than what has transpired in the United States.

When the SNP took office, there was a strong urge to do 'something different', and the Scottish government is undoubtedly well intentioned. For example, it has prioritized free higher education, free prescription charges, and free care for the elderly, while the rest of the United Kingdom has gone in a different direction. It has not reduced taxes for higher earners, while other UK countries have. Hitherto, Scotland's educational testing practices have provided national-level data without washback problems, although they appear to have been replaced by the new national testing scheme and it remains to be seen whether a balance can be found between the different considerations and goals of the nation as it aspires to independence.

References

- Arnholtz, J., & Hammerslev, O. (2013). Transcended power of the state: The role of actors in Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of the state. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 14(1), 42–64.
- Arnott, M., & Ozga, J. (2010). Education and nationalism: The discourse of education policy in Scotland. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 31(3), 335–350.

- Au, W. (2008). Devising inequality: A Bernsteinian analysis of educational testing and social reproduction in education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 639–651.
- Au, W. (2009a). High-stakes testing and discursive control: The triple bind for non-standard student identities. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(2), 65–71.
- Au, W. (2009b). Obama, where art thou? Hoping for change in U.S. education policy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(2), 309–320.
- Au, W. (2009c). *Unequal by design: Educational testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Au, W. (2010). The idiocy of policy: The anti-democratic curriculum of educational testing. *Critical Education*, 1(1).
- Au, W. (2015a). *Just whose rights do these civil rights groups think they are protecting?* Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2015/05/09/just-whose-rights-do-these-civil-rights-groups-think-they-are-protecting/
- Au, W. (2015b). Meritocracy 2.0: High-stakes, standardized testing as a racial project of neo-liberal multiculturalism. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 39–62.
- Au, W. (2016). Techies, the Tea Party, and the Common Core: The rise of the new upper middle class and tensions in the rightist politics of federal education reform. *Educational Forum*, 80(2).
- Au, W., & Hollar, J. (2016). Opting out of the education reform industry. *Monthly Review*, 67(10), 29–37.
- Baker, O., & Lang, K. (2013). *The effect of high school exit exams on graduation, employment, wages, and incarceration*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Baker, S., Myers, A., & Vasquez, B. (2014). Desegregation, accountability, and equality: North Carolina and the Nation, 1971–2002. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(117), 1–30.
- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *On the state: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1989–1992*. P. Champagne, R. Lenoir, F. Poupeau, & M-C. Rivière (Eds.) (D. Fernbach, Trans.). Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- British Broadcasting Corporation. (2015). Scotland's first minister Nicola Sturgeon unveils tests plan for schools. *BBC News*, 1 September. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-34108173
- British Broadcasting Corporation. (2016a). *Nicola Sturgeon details standardised school testing plans*, 6 January. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-35237834
- British Broadcasting Corporation. (2016b). *John Swinney: New school tests are 'not high stakes' exams*, 25 November. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-38110789
- Brooks, K. (2014). Education gap is an 'urgent' civil rights issue: George W. Bush. *Reuters*. Retrieved from www.reuters.com/article/2014/04/11/us-usa-bush-rights-idUSBREA3A00X20140411
- Brown, E. (2015). Why civil rights groups say parent who opt out of tests are hurting kids. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/why-civil-rights-groups-say-parents-who-opt-out-of-tests-are-hurting-kids/2015/05/05/59884b9a-f32c-11e4-bcc4-e8141e5eb0c9_story.html
- CNN. (2002). *Bush calls education 'civil rights issue of our time'*. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/19/bush.democrats.radio/>
- Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 99–112.

- Crawford, J. (2007). A diminished vision of Civil Rights: No Child Left Behind and the growing divide in how educational equity is understood. *Education Week*, 26(39), 31, 40.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'no child left behind'. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 10(3), 245–269.
- Depaepe, M., & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an ongoing modernization process. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 379–389.
- Dorn, S. (2007). *Accountability Frankenstein: Understanding and taming the monster*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Edinburgh News. (2016). John Swinney says new tests will not mean extra work for pupils. Retrieved 26 January 2017, from www.edinburghnews.scotsman.com/news/education/john-swinney-says-new-tests-will-not-mean-extra-work-for-pupils-1-4301753
- Educational Institute of Scotland. (2015). *EIS raises national testing concerns in evidence to Scottish Parliament*. Retrieved from www.eis.org.uk/public.asp?id=3145#
- Feinberg, C. (2004). Rod Paige offers high praise for No Child Left Behind: Education secretary marks 50th anniversary of Brown decision with Kennedy School keynote address. *Harvard University Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/2004/04.29/09-brown.html>
- Hagopian, J., & Network for Public Education. (2015). *Resistance to high stakes tests serves the cause of equity in education: A reply to 'We oppose anti-testing efforts'*. Retrieved from <http://networkforpubliceducation.org/2015/05/resistance-to-educational-tests-serves-the-cause-of-equity-in-education/>
- Hansen, H. K., & Porter, T. (2012). What do numbers do in transnational governance? *International Political Sociology*, 6(4), 409–426.
- Hayward, E. L., & Hutchinson, C. (2013). 'Exactly what do you mean by consistency?' Exploring concepts of consistency and standards in Curriculum for Excellence in Scotland. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 53–68.
- Herald Scotland. (2016). *Fresh warning over national testing for Scottish primary schools*, 6 July. Retrieved from www.heraldsotland.com/news/14600029.Fresh_warning_over_national_testing_for_Scottish_primary_schools/
- Hopmann, S. T. (Ed.). (2007). *PISA zufolge PISA; PISA according to PISA; hält PISA, was es verspricht?* Vienna: Lit Verlag.
- Hursh, D. W. (2007). Exacerbating inequality: The failed promise of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 10(3), 295–308.
- Hutchinson, C., & Hayward, L. (2005). The journey so far: Assessment for learning in Scotland. *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 225–248.
- Karp, S. (2016). ESSA: NCLB repackaged. *Rethinking Schools*, 30(3). Retrieved from www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/30_03/30-3_karp.shtml
- Kornhaber, M. L., & Orfield, G. (2001). High-stakes testing policies: Examining their assumptions and consequences. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Raising standards or raising barriers? Inequality and high-stakes testing in public education*. New York: Century Foundation Press, pp. 1–18.
- Lawn, M., & Deary, I. (2014). The new model school of education: Thomson, Moray House and Teachers College, Columbia. *Paedagogica Historica*, 50(3), 301–319.
- Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. (2015). *Civil rights groups: 'We oppose anti-testing efforts': Participation in assessments critical for expanding educational opportunity for all students*, 5 May. Retrieved from www.civilrights.org/press/2015/anti-testing-efforts.html
- Lee, J. (2006). *Tracking achievement gaps and assessing the impact of NCLB on the gaps: An in-depth look into national and state reading and math outcome trends*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Civil Rights Project.

- Liebman, J. S., & Sabel, C. F. (2003). The federal No Child Left Behind Act and the post-desegregation civil rights agenda. *North Carolina Law Review*, 81(4), 1703–1750.
- Lindblad, S., Pettersson, D., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2015). *International comparisons of school results: A systematic review of research on large scale assessments in education. A report from the educational research project SKOLFORSK*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council.
- Madaus, G., Russell, M., & Higgins, J. (2009). *The paradoxes of high stakes testing*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- McEnaney, J. (2016). *National standardised testing – The story so far*; bellacaledonia.org.uk. 24 May. Retrieved from <http://bellacaledonia.org.uk/2016/05/24/national-standardised-testing-the-story-so-far/>
- McIvor, J. (2016). Survey finds parents concerned over new assessments. *BBC News*, 5 January. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-35222631
- National Research Council. (2011). Incentives and test-based accountability in education. In M. Hout & S. W. Elliott (Eds.), *Committee on incentives and test-based accountability in public education*. Washington, DC: Board on Testing and Assessment, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences Education.
- Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral damage: How educational testing corrupts America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). *Synergies for better learning: An international perspective on evaluation and assessment*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). *Improving schools in Scotland: An OECD perspective*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/education/school/Improving-Schools-in-Scotland-An-OECD-Perspective.pdf
- Ozga, J. (2011). Governing narratives: Local meanings and globalising education policy. *Education Inquiry*, 2(2), 305–318.
- Paige, R. (2006). *Dr. Paige remarks to Thomas M. Cooley law school*. Retrieved from www.rodpaige.com/node/7
- Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Reese, W. J. (2013). *Testing wars in the public schools: A forgotten history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Resmovits, J. (2014). *60 years after Brown v. BOE, mostly white reformers try to fix 'the civil rights issue of our generation'*. Retrieved from www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/17/race-in-ed-reform_n_5339713.html
- Rhodes, J. H. (2011). Progressive policy making in a conservative age? Civil Rights and the politics of federal education standards, testing, and accountability. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(3), 519–544.
- Scottish Government. (2011). *Education Scotland – Remit and purpose*. Retrieved from www.gov.scot/Topics/Education/Schools/Latest/SEQIAremit
- Scottish Government. (2015a). *A draft National Improvement Framework for Scottish Education*. Retrieved 18 January 2017, from www.gov.scot/Publications/2015/09/7802/2
- Scottish Government. (2015b). *Creating a smarter Scotland – A draft national improvement framework for Scottish education*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2016a). *National improvement framework for Scottish education: Achieving excellence and equity*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2016b). *2017 National improvement framework for Scottish education and improvement plan for Scottish education*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.
- Smith, W. C. (Ed.). (2016). *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

- Weber, M. (2009). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Ydesen, C. (2011). *The rise of educational testing in Denmark, 1920–1970*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Ydesen, C. (2014). Educational testing and democracy: Antagonistic or symbiotic relationship? *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(2), 97–114.
- Ydesen, C. (2016). Crafting the English welfare state—interventions by Birmingham Local Education Authorities, 1948–1963. *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(4), 614–630.
- Zabala, D. (2007). *State high school exit exams: Gaps persist in high school exit exam pass rates – Policy brief 3*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

References

The tension field between testing and inclusion: introducing a research endeavour

McNeely, C. A., Morland, L., Doty, S. B., Meschke, L. L., Awad, S., Husain, A., & Nashwan, A. (2017). How schools can promote healthy development for newly arrived immigrant and refugee adolescents: Research priorities. *Journal of School Health*, 87, 121-132. doi:10.1111/josh.12477

Morin, A. (2015). Children's conduct of life - across general school, educational psychology consultation and psychiatry. *Nordic Psychology*, 67(3), 225-240.

Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A.-M. (2004). *Education policy: Globalisation, citizenship, democracy*. London: Sage Publications.

Padovan-Özdemir, M., & Ydesen, C. (2016). Professional encounters with the post-WWII immigrant: A privileged prism for studying the shaping of European welfare nation-states. *Paedagogica Historica*, 52(5), 423-437. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2016.1211156>

Pereyra, M. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Pisa under examination: Changing knowledge, changing tests and changing schools*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. Wiltshire: Routledge.

Slee, R. (2013). Meeting some challenges of inclusive education in an age of exclusion. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(2), 3-17.

Smith, W. C. (Ed.). (2016). *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Tomlinson, S. (2012). The irresistible rise of the SEN industry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(3), 267-286.

Vladimirova, K., & Le Blanc, D. (2016). Exploring links between education and sustainable development goals through the lens of UN flagship reports. *Sustainable Development*, 24, 254-271. doi:10.1002/sd.1626

Ydesen, C. (2016). Crafting the English welfare state-interventions by Birmingham local education authorities, 1948-1963. *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(4), 614-630. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3223>

1 Educational testing, the question of the public good, and room for inclusion: a comparative study of Scotland and the United States

Arnholtz, J., & Hammerslev, O. (2013). Transcended power of the state: The role of actors in Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of the state. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 14(1), 42-64.

Arnott, M., & Ozga, J. (2010). Education and nationalism: The discourse of education policy in Scotland. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 31(3), 335-350. Au, W. (2008). Devising inequality: A Bernsteinian analysis of educational testing and social reproduction in education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(6), 639-651. Au, W. (2009a). High-stakes testing and discursive control: The triple bind for non-standard student identities. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(2), 65-71. Au, W. (2009b). Obama, where art thou? Hoping for change in U.S. education policy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(2), 309-320. Au, W. (2009c). *Unequal by design: Educational testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Au, W. (2010). The idiocy of policy: The anti-democratic curriculum of educational testing. *Critical Education*, 1(1).

Au, W. (2015a). Just whose rights do these civil rights groups think they are protecting? Retrieved from

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

British Broadcasting Corporation. (2015). Scotland's first minister Nicola Sturgeon unveils tests plan for schools. BBC News, 1 September. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-34108173

British Broadcasting Corporation. (2016a). Nicola Sturgeon details standardised school testing plans, 6 January. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-35237834

British Broadcasting Corporation. (2016b). John Swinney: New school tests are 'not high stakes' exams, 25 November.

Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-38110789

Brooks, K. (2014). Education gap is an 'urgent' civil rights issue: George W. Bush. Reuters. Retrieved from www.reuters.com/article/2014/04/11/us-usa-bush-rights-idUSBREA3A00X20140411

Brown, E. (2015). Why civil rights groups say parent who opt out of tests are hurting kids. Washington Post. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/local/

CNN. (2002). Bush calls education 'civil rights issue of our time'. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/01/19/bush.democrats.radio/>

Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 99-112.

Crawford, J. (2007). A diminished vision of Civil Rights: No Child Left Behind and the growing divide in how educational equity is understood. *Education Week*, 26(39), 31, 40.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'no child left behind'. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 10(3), 245-269.

Depaepe, M., & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an ongoing modernization process. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 379-389.

Dorn, S. (2007). *Accountability Frankenstein: Understanding and taming the monster*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Edinburgh News. (2016). John Swinney says new tests will not mean extra work for pupils. Retrieved 26 January 2017, from [www.edinburghnews.scotsman.com/news/ education/](http://www.edinburghnews.scotsman.com/news/education/)

Educational Institute of Scotland. (2015). EIS raises national testing concerns in evidence to Scottish Parliament. Retrieved from www.eis.org.uk/public.asp?id=3145#

Feinberg, C. (2004). Rod Paige offers high praise for No Child Left Behind: Education secretary marks 50th anniversary of Brown decision with Kennedy School keynote address. *Harvard University Gazette*. Retrieved from <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/2004/04.29/09-brown.html>

Hagopian, J., & Network for Public Education. (2015). Resistance to high stakes tests serves the cause of equity in education: A reply to 'We oppose anti-testing efforts'. Retrieved from

Hansen, H. K., & Porter, T. (2012). What do numbers do in transnational governance? *International Political Sociology*, 6(4), 409-426.

Hayward, E. L., & Hutchinson, C. (2013). 'Exactly what do you mean by consistency?' Exploring concepts of consistency and standards in Curriculum for Excellence in Scotland. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(1), 53-68.

Herald Scotland. (2016). Fresh warning over national testing for Scottish primary schools, 6 July. Retrieved from

Hopmann, S. T. (Ed.). (2007). PISA zufolge PISA; PISA according to PISA; hält PISA, was es verspricht? Vienna: Lit Verlag.

Hursh, D. W. (2007). Exacerbating inequality: The failed promise of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 10(3), 295-308.

Hutchinson, C., & Hayward, L. (2005). The journey so far: Assessment for learning in Scotland. *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 225-248.

Karp, S. (2016). ESSA: NCLB repackaged. *Rethinking Schools*, 30(3). Retrieved from www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/30_03/30-3_karp.shtml

Kornhaber, M. L., & Orfield, G. (2001). High-stakes testing policies: Examining their assumptions and consequences. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Raising standards or raising barriers? Inequality and high-stakes testing in public education*. New York: Century Foundation Press, pp. 1-18.

Lawn, M., & Dear y, I. (2014). The new model school of education: Thomson, Moray House and Teachers College, Columbia. *Paedagogica Historica*, 50(3), 301-319.

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. (2015). Civil rights groups: 'We oppose anti-testing efforts': Participation in assessments critical for expanding educational opportunity for all students, 5 May. Retrieved

from www.civilrights.org/press/2015/anti-testing-efforts.html

Lee, J. (2006). Tracking achievement gaps and assessing the impact of NCLB on the gaps: An in-depth look into national and state reading and math outcome trends. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Civil Rights Project. Liebman, J. S., & Sabel, C. F. (2003). The federal No Child Left Behind Act and the postdesegregation civil rights agenda. *North Carolina Law Review*, 81(4), 1703-1750.

Lindblad, S., Pettersson, D., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2015). International comparisons of school results: A systematic review of research on large scale assessments in education. A report from the educational research project SKOLFORSK. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council. Madaus, G., Russell, M., & Higgins, J. (2009). The paradoxes of high stakes testing. Charlotte, NC: Information Age. McEneaney, J. (2016). National standardised testing - The story so far; bellacaledonia.org.uk. 24 May. Retrieved from

Weber, M. (2009). From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. New York: Routledge.

Ydesen, C. (2011). The rise of educational testing in Denmark, 1920-1970. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.

Ydesen, C. (2014). Educational testing and democracy: Antagonistic or symbiotic relationship? *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(2), 97-114.

Ydesen, C. (2016). Crafting the English welfare state-interventions by Birmingham Local Education Authorities, 1948-1963. *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(4), 614-630.

Zabala, D. (2007). State high school exit exams: Gaps persist in high school exit exam pass rates - Policy brief 3. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

2 Minorities and educational testing in schools in Arctic regions: an analysis and discussion focusing on normality, democracy, and inclusion for the cases of Greenland and the Swedish Sami schools

Kousholt, K. (2016). Testing as social practice: Analysing testing in classes of young children from the children's perspective. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(3), 377-392.

Kousholt, K., & Andreassen, K. E. (2015). De nationale test som ny praksis i den danske folkeskole: Betydninger i klassens sociale fællesskab. In K. E. Andreassen, M. Buchardt, A. Rasmussen, & C. Ydesen (red.), *Test og prøvelser: Oprindelse, udvikling, aktualitet* (1 udg., Kapitel 1). Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag, s. 29-49. Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice. Mind, mathematics and culture of everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawn, M., & Greek, S. (2012). *Europeanizing education - Governing a new policy space*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Lindgren, E., Sullivan, K. P., Outakoski, H., & Westum, A. (2016). Researching literacy development in the globalised North: Studying tri-lingual children's English writing in Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish Sápmi. In D. R. Cole & C. Woodrow (Eds.), *Super dimensions in globalisation and education*. Singapore: Springer, pp. 55-68. E-book.

Madaus, G., Russell, M., & Higgins, J. (2009). *The paradoxes of high stakes testing: How they affect the students, their parents, teachers, principals, schools, and society*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Muus, N. (2009). Who are the Sámi? *Vesterheim*, 7 (2).

Omma, L. M., Holmgren, L. E., & Jacobsson, L. H. (2011). Being a young Sami in Sweden: Living conditions, identity and life satisfaction. *Journal of Northern Studies*, 9-28.

Pettersson, A. (2004). *The national tests and national assessment in Sweden*. PRIM-gruppen. Stockholm Institute of Education, Stockholm, Sweden.

Reay, D., & Wiliam, D. (1999). I'll be a nothing: Structure, agency and the construction of identity through assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(3), 343, 354.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.

Samuelsson, J., Brismark, A., & Löfgren, H. (2015). 'Nu har vi Dexter' - Lärares förändrade arbete med administration i reformernas och digitaliseringens tidevarv. [Now we have Dexter - Teachers changed administration in times of reforms and digitalization] *Kapet*, 12(1), 38-59.

Serpell, R. (2000). Intelligence and culture. In R. Sternberg (Ed.). *Handbook of intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 549-570.

Smith, W. C. (2016). An introduction to the global testing culture. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The Global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Stoor, J. P. et al. (2017). Plan for suicide prevention among the Sàmi people in Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Sàmi Norwegian National Advisory Unit on Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Sanks) & Saami Council.

Stobart, G. (2008). *Testing times. The uses and abuses of assessment*. New York: Routledge.

Swedish Institute. (2014). Sami in Sweden. Sweden.se. Retrieved 18 October 2017, from

United Nations. (1948). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly [Part A of General Assembly Resolution 217 (III). International Bill of Human Rights] 217 A (III). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 183rd Plenary Meeting 10 December 1948. UN Documents, United Nations General Assembly A/RES/3/217 A. Retrieved 22 October 2017, from www.un-documents.net/a3r217a.htm

Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (1998). *Successful failure: The school America builds*. Boulder, CO, and Oxford: Westview Press.

Wyatt, T. R., & Lyberth, N. (2011). Addressing systemic oppression in Greenland's preschools: The adaptation of a coaching model. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(2),

221-232. Ydesen, C. (2011). The rise of high-stakes educational testing in Denmark (1920-1970). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag. Reports and guidelines Allerup, P., Karlsen, E. J., Therkelsen, E., & Petersen, C. (2015). Analyser og resultater af trintest 2014 i den grønlandske folkeskole. [Analysis and results of step test 2014 in Grenland public school] Institut for Læring - Inerisaavik, Naliliisarfik. Allerup, P., Karlsen, E. J., Therkelsen, E., & Petersen, C. (2016). Analyser og resultater af Trintest 2015 i den grønlandske folkeskole [Analysis and results of step test 2015 in Greenland public school]. Uddannelsesstyrelsen, Evalueringsafdelingen. Danish Ministry of Education [Undervisningsministeriet]. (2018). Vejledning om de nationale test - til lærere i alle fag [Guidelines for the Danish National Test]. Undervisningsministeriet Styrelsen for Undervisning og Kvalitet, Copenhagen. Retrieved 20 March 2018 at <https://www>

Swedish National Agency for Education [Skolverket]. (2016). Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011.[Curriculum for preschool and after-school centre] Reviderad 2016. Swedish National Agency for Education [Skolverket].

Swedish School Inspectorate [Skolinpektionen]. (2013). Sameskolan. Riktad tillsyn huvudrapport. Dnr 401-2011: 3028, 1(28). [Sami School. Supervision, main report] Report. Swedish School Inspectorate [Skolinpektionen]. Retrieved 18 October 2017, from www.

3 Educational opportunity between meritocracy and equity: a review of the National College Entrance Examination in China since 1977

Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. London: Polity Press.

Brint, S. (2006). *Schools and societies*, 3rd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cai, W. (2016). Why implement a 'quota plan for supporting the Central and West Regions' [in Chinese]. *China Education Daily*, 6 June, p. 1. Cheng, G., Guo, J., & Gao, H. (2009). Regional difference in college enrolment in China: Case study on college enrolment in Gansu [in Chinese]. *Journal of Northwest Normal University (Social Sciences)*, 46(6), 115-119. China Education Online. (2016). Parents from Jiangsu and Hubei are discontent with the crossprovince quota adjustment plan [in Chinese]. Retrieved 10 March 2017, from http://gaokao.eol.cn/hu_bei/dongtai/201605/t20160525_1402157.shtml Djilas, M. (1957). *The new class: An analysis of the communist system*. New York: Praeger. Halsey, A. H., Ridge, J. M., Heath, A. F., & Halsey, A. H. (1980). *Origins and destinations*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hoffer, T. (2002). Meritocracy. In D. Levenson, P. Cookson, Jr., & A. Sadvnik (Eds.), *Education and sociology: An encyclopaedia*. New York: Routledge Falmer, pp. 435-442.

Lemann, N. (1999). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York: Farrar Strauss Giroux.

Levin, H. M. (1975). Education, life chances, and the courts: The role of social science evidence. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 39(2), 217-240.

Li, C. (2014). The educational experience and inequality of people born in the 1980s [in Chinese]. *Social Sciences in China*, (4) March, 2.

Liu, H. (2015). The historical logic of college entrance examination from provincial test to national test [in Chinese]. *China Education Daily*, 2015-03-12.

Liu, H., & Li, M. (2014). The establishment and adjustment of province-based quota plan system in college admission

[in Chinese]. Educational Research, (6), 73-80.

Liu, J. (2006). Higher education expansion and difference in access (1978-2003) [in Chinese]. Society, 26(3), 158-179.

Liu, Y. (2009). Details of democracy: Essays on contemporary politics in the United States [in Chinese]. Shanghai: Shanghai Joint Publishing Company.

Ma, Y., & Yang, D. (2015). The evolution and path analysis on inequality in higher education opportunity between students from urban and rural areas [in Chinese]. Tsinghua Journal of Education, 36(2), 7-13.

McMahon, W. W., & Oketch, M. (2013). Education's effects on individual life chances and on development: An overview. British Journal of Educational Studies, 61(1), 79-107.

Ministry of Education. (1988). Regulations on college admission by recommendation. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s3258/201001/79924.html

Ministry of Education. (2007). Notice on college admission by recommendation in 2008. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from http://old.moe.gov.cn//publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_1965/200802/31443.html

Ministry of Education. (2011). Notice on admission through college self-organized test in 2012. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s3110/201111/xxgk_127339.html

Ministry of Education. (2014). Notice on college admission in 2014. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). List of '211 project' colleges. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from

Ministry of Education & National Development and Reform Commission. (2008). Notice on quota plan for higher education enrollment in 2008. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from www.moe.edu.cn

Ministry of Education, National Development and Reform Commission, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Human

Resource, & State Office for Supporting Poverty. (2012). Notice on special quota plan for poverty regions in college admission. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/A15_zcwj/201204/xxgk_134392.html

Ministry of Education, State Ethnic Affairs Commission, Ministry of Public Security, General Administration of Sport, China Association of Science and Technology. (2014). Opinions on reducing and restricting score-adding in college admission. Retrieved 15 March 2017, from

Nee, V. (1989). A theory of market transition: From redistribution to markets in state socialism. *American Sociological Review*, 54(5), 663-681.

Nee, V. (1991). Social inequality in reforming states socialism: Between redistribution and markets in China. *American Sociological Review*, 56(3), 267-282.

Norwich, B. (2014). *Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty*. New York: Routledge.

Pang, S. (2016). Market transition, educational tracking and inequality in higher education opportunity between urban and rural areas in China (1977-2008) [in Chinese]. *Chinese Journal of Sociology*, 36(5), 155-174.

Qiao, J. (2007). Regional difference in access to high quality higher education [in Chinese]. *Beijing Normal University Journal (Social Sciences)*, 1, 23-28.

Si, H. (2007). Enrollment of national universities in their locating provinces: The encroaching of national interest [in Chinese]. *Education and Occupation*, 1, 20-24.

Slee, R. (2013). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(8), 895-907.

Slee, R. (2014). Discourses of inclusion and exclusion: drawing wider margins. *Power & Education*, 6(1), 7-17.

Szelényi, I. (1978). Social inequalities in state socialist redistributive economies. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 19(1-2), 63-87.

Tan, M., & Xie, Z. (2009). Analysis on development of

higher education for minorities since the expansion of higher education [in Chinese]. *Higher Education Exploration*, 2, 26-31.

Mu, Y. (2013). Evolution of inequality in educational opportunities between urban and rural citizens in China (1978-2008) [in Chinese]. *Social Sciences in China*, 3, 4-21.

Yang, X. (2007). A historical review of college entrance examination in China [in Chinese]. Wuhan: Hubei People's Publisher.

Young, M. (1958). *The rise of the meritocracy 1870-2033: An essay on education and equality*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Zhang, Q. (2011). An analysis on the constitutionality of the quota system in college entrance examination [in Chinese]. *Peking University Law Journal*, 23(2), 248-269.

Zhang, X., & Zhang, Q. (2015). Impact analysis on 'quota plan for supporting the Central and West regions': Case study on '985 Project' institutions [in Chinese]. *Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 36(3), 58-56.

Zhao, W., & Zhou, X. (2016). From institutional segmentation to market fragmentation: Institutional transformation and the shifting stratification order in urban China. *Social Science Research*, 63, 19-35.

Zhou, X. (2004). *The state and life chances in urban China: Redistribution and stratification, 1949-1994*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zhou, X., Moen, P., & Tuma, N. B. (1998). Educational stratification in urban China: 1949-1994. *Sociology of Education*, 71(3), 199-222.

Zou, Y. (2013). *Quality of higher education: Organizational and educational perspectives*. Aalborg, Denmark: River Publishers.

4 The 'problem' of 'quality' schooling, national testing, and inclusion: Australian insights into policy and practice

Anagnostopoulos, D., Rutledge, S., & Jacobsen, R. (2013). The infrastructure of accountability: Data use and the transformation of American education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017a). NAP – National Assessment Program. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from www.nap.edu.au

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017b). NAPLAN 2017 finishes without the world ending. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from www.acara.edu.au/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2017c). Why NAP? Retrieved 21 May 2017, from www.nap.edu.au/about/why-nap

Australian Government. (2016). Quality schools, quality outcomes. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from

Australian Government. (2017). Retrieved 21 May 2017, from www.education.gov.au/schooling

Bacchi, C. (2009). Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be? French's Forests, NSW, Australia: Pearson.

Biesta, B. (2015). Resisting the seduction of the global education measurement industry: Notes on the social psychology of PISA. *Ethics and Education*, 10(3), 348-360.

Cumming, J., Wyatt-Smith, C., & Colbert, P. (2016). Students 'at risk' and NAPLAN: The 'collateral damage'. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment*. New York: Routledge, pp. 126-138.

Dulfer, N., Polesel, J., & Rice, S. (2012). The experience of education: The impacts of high stakes testing on school students and their families. Melbourne: Whitlam Institute, University of Melbourne, Foundation for Young Australians.

Easton, D. (1953). The political system: An inquiry into the state of political science. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Hardy, I., & Woodcock, S. (2015). Inclusive education policies: Discourses of difference, diversity and deficit. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(2), 141-164.

Lingard, B., Thompson, G., & Sellar, S. (2016). National testing from an Australian perspective. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-17.

New South Wales Department of Education and Communities. (2012). *Every student, every school: Learning and support*. Sydney: New South Wales Department of Education and Communities. New South Wales Department of Education and Training. (2016). *Improving education results*. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from <http://nsw.gov.au> New South Wales Department of Education and Training. (2017). *Our schools, our story*. Retrieved 21 May 2017, from www.dec.nsw.gov.au/about-the-department/our-reforms Ng, C., Wyatt-Smith, C., & Bartlett, B. (2016). Disadvantaged students' voices on national testing: The submersion of NAPLAN's formative potential. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment*. New York: Routledge, pp. 152-163. O'Shea, A., & Lorenzi, F. (2015). The unquantifiable as a measure of good education. *Ethics and Education*, 10(3), 361-371.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Vass, G., & Chalmers, G. (2016). NAPLAN, achievement gaps and embedding Indigenous perspectives in schooling: Disrupting the decolonial option. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment*. New York: Routledge, pp. 139-151. Woodcock, S., & Hardy, I. (2017). Beyond the binary: Rethinking teachers' understandings of and engagement with inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(6), 667-686.

5 Standardized assessment and the shaping of neoliberal student subjectivities

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structure of pedagogic discourse*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor Francis.

Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and horizontal discourse: An essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 157-173.

Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33-46.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.

De Lauretis, T. (1986). Feminist studies/critical studies: Issues, terms and contexts. In T. De Lauretis (Ed.), *Feminist critical studies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism in creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 22-44.

House of Commons. (2008). *Testing and assessment: Third report of session 2007-2008*. Retrieved 1 May 2016, from

Marx, K. (1844). *The economic and philosophical manuscripts*. Retrieved 1 September 2016, from

Marx, K. (1859). *A contribution to the critique of political economy*. Retrieved 1 September 2016, from

Sennett, R. (2009). *The craftsman*. London: Penguin.

Stevenson, H., & Wood, P. (2013). Markets, managerialism and teachers' work: The invisible hand of high-stakes testing in England. *International Education Journal Comparative Perspectives*, 12(2), 42-61.

Section essay: 'The banality of numbers'

Santiago, P., Tremblay, K., Basri, E., & Arnal, E. (2008). What next? The challenges of policy implementation. Tertiary education for the knowledge society, (Vol. 1: Special Features: Governance, Funding, Quality. Paris: OECD.

Slee, R. (2011). The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education. London: Routledge.

Walter, R. (2008). Foucault and radical deliberative democracy. Australian Journal of Political Science, 43, 531-546.

6 Quality and inclusion in the SDGs: tension in principle and practice

Ahsan, S., & Smith, W. C. (2016). Facilitating student learning: A comparison of classroom and accountability assessment. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The global testing culture: Shaping educational policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 131-152.

Allan, J. (2012). The inclusion challenge. In T. Barow & D. Östlund (Eds.), *Bildning För Alla! En Pedagogisk Utmaning* [Education for everyone! A pedagogical challenge]. Tryck: Högskolan Kristianstad, pp. 109-120.

Allen, R., Elks, P., Outhred, R., & Varly, P. (2016). *Uganda's assessment system: A road-map for enhancing assessment in education*. Oxford: Health & Education Advice & Resource Team.

Anderson, J., & Boyle, C. (2015). Inclusive education in Australia: Rhetoric, reality and the road ahead. *Support for Learning*, 30(1), 4-22.

Anderson, J., Boyle, C., & Deppeler, J. (2014). The ecology of inclusive education: Reconceptualising Bronfenbrenner. In H. Zhang, P. W. K. Chan, & C. Boyle (Eds.), *Equality in education: Fairness and inclusion*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 23-34.

Anderson, B., Murphy, K. M., & Saultz, A. (2016). Under pressure in Atlanta: School accountability and special education practices during the cheating scandal. *Teachers College Record*, 118(14).

Artiles, A. J., Harris-Murri, N., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead. *Theory into Practice*, 45, 260-268.

Atai, E. (2015). 2014 PLE results release. 91.2 Crooze FM, 15 January 2015. Retrieved from <http://croozeFM.com/2014-ple-results-released/>

Bashir, S. (2009). *Changing the trajectory: Education and training for youth in Democratic Republic of Congo*. World Bank Working Paper, 169.

Best, M., Knight, P., Lietz, P., Lockwood, C., Nugroho, D., & Tobin M. (2013). The impact of national and international assessment programmes on education policy,

particularly policies regarding resource allocation and teaching and learning practices in developing countries. London: EPPI-Centre.

Bjorkman-Nyqvist, M. (2013). Income shocks and gender gaps in education: Evidence from Uganda. *Journal of Development Economics*, 105, 237-253.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Castro-Villarreal, F., & Nichols, S. L. (2016). Intersection of accountability and special education: The social justice implications of policy and practice. *Teachers College Record*, 118(14).

Chapman, D. W., Burton, L., & Werner, J. (2010). Universal secondary education in Uganda: The head teachers' dilemma. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(1), 77-82.

Clark, C., Dyson, A., Millward, A., & Robson, S. (1999). Theories of inclusion, theories of schools: Deconstructing and reconstructing the 'inclusive school'. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(2), 157-176. Cumming, J. J., & Dickson, E. (2013). Educational accountability tests, social and legal inclusion approaches to discrimination for students with disability: A national case study from Australia. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 221-239. Dennison, D. B. (2014). The education of special needs children in Uganda: Legal policy lessons from the United States. *Journal of the Christian Institute on Disability*, 3(2), 15-44. Ejuu, G. (2016). Moving in circles along a straight path: The elusiveness of inclusive education in early childhood development in Uganda. *Journal of Childhood & Developmental Disorders*, 2(1). Elks, P. (2016). The impact of assessment results on education policy and practice in East Africa. DFID Think Piece. Oxford: Health & Education Advice & Resource Team. Franck, B., & Joshi, D. K. (2017). Including students with disabilities in Education for All: Lessons from Ethiopia. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(4), 347-360. Hayashi, M. (2016). Diversity in international policy on education equity and inclusion of social groups: A case of 77 state parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 27, 195-211. Hill, P. (2010). *Examination systems: Asia-Pacific secondary education system review series*. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok.

Huylebroeck, L., & Titeca, K. (2015). Universal secondary education in Uganda: Blessing or curse? The impact of USE on educational attainment and performance. In F. Reyntjens, S. Vandeginste, & M. Verpoorten (Eds.), *L'Afrique des grands lacs: Annuaire 2014-2015*. Antwerp: University Press Antwerp, pp. 349-372.

Kamenetz, A. (2015). *The test: Why our schools are obsessed with standardized testing - But you don't have to be*. Philadelphia, PA: Public Affairs.

Kavuma, R. M. (2010). *Explainer: The education system in Uganda*. The Guardian, 8 February 2010. Retrieved from www.theguardian.com/katine/2010/feb/08/education-system-explainer

Kizza, J. (2017). 2016 PLE: Boys beat girls, performance improves. New Vision: Uganda's Learning Daily, 12 January 2017. Retrieved from www.newvision.co.ug/new_vision/news/1443897/ple-results-boys-beat-girls-english-improved

Komoso, P. K., Otiso, K. M., & Ye, X. (2015). Spatial and gender inequality in the Kenya certificate of primary education examination results. *Applied Geography*, 62, 44-61.

Lemann, N. (1999). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Miles, S., & Singal, N. (2010). The Education for All and inclusive education debate: Conflict, contradiction or opportunity? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(1), 1-15.

Murchan, D., Shiel, G., & Mickovska, G. (2012). An education system in transition: Assessment and examinations in the Republic of Macedonia. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 19(4), 487-502.

Murgatroyd, S., & Sahlberg, P. (2016). The two solitudes of educational policy and the challenge of development. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 3(3), 9-21.

Mzuza, M. K., Yudong, Y., & Kaute, F. (2014). Analysis of factors causing poor passing rates and high dropout rates among primary school girls in Malawi. *World Journal of Education*, 4(1), 48-61.

Omoeva, C., Chaluda, A., Moussa, W., Hatch, R., & Smith, W. (2016). *Financing education equity: A study of three country case studies*. Research report commissioned by the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity. Retrieved from <http://report.educationcommission.org/download/995/>

Robertson, H. (1999). In Canada - Bogus points. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(9), 715-716.

Slee, R. (2013a). Meeting some challenges of inclusive education in an age of exclusion. *Asian Journal of*

Inclusive Education, 1(2), 3-17.

Slee, R. (2013b). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(8), 895-907.

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 11(2), 173-192.

Smith, W. C. (2014). The global transformation toward testing for accountability. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(116).

Smith, W. C. (2016a). An introduction to the global testing culture. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The global testing culture: Shaping educational policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 7-24.

Smith, W. C. (Ed.). (2016b). *The global testing culture: Shaping educational policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Smith, W. C. (2017). National testing policies and educator based testing for accountability: The role of selective admission practices in student achievement. *OECD Journal: Economic Studies*, 2016(1), 131-150.

Ssewamala, F. M., Wang, J. S. H., Karimli, L., & Nabunya, P. (2011). Strengthening universal primary education in Uganda: The potential role of an asset-based development policy. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(5), 472-477.

Theoharis, G., Causton, J., & Tracy-Bronson, C. P. (2016). Inclusive reform as a response to high-stakes pressure? Leading toward inclusion in the age of accountability. *Teachers College Record*, 118(14).

Uganda National Examinations Board. (2017). 2016 PLE results. Retrieved from www.education.go.ug/files/downloads/PLE_Results_2016.pdf

Uganda National Planning Authority. (2015). Pre-primary and primary education in Uganda: Access, cost, quality and relevance. Retrieved from <http://npa.ug/wp-content/uploads/NDPF5-Paper-3172015.pdf>

United Nations. (2015). Historic new sustainable

development agenda unanimously adopted by 193 UN members, 25 September 2015. Retrieved from www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). EFA global monitoring report. Education for All 2000-2015: Achievements and challenges. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002322/232205e.pdf>

Waitoller, F. R., & Pazey, B. L. (2016). Examining competing notions of social justice at the intersections of high-stakes testing practices and parents' rights: An inclusive education perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 118(14).

Zeitlyn, B., Lewin, K. M., Chimombo, J., & Meka, E. (2015). Inside private secondary schools in Malawi: Access or exclusion? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 43, 109-117.

7 School reforms, market logic, and the politics of inclusion in the United States and Denmark

Allan, J. (2010). The sociology of disability and the struggle for inclusive education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31, 603-619.

Andersen, V. N., Dahler-Larsen, P., & Pedersen, C. S. (2009). Quality assurance and evaluation in Denmark. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(2), 135-147.

Bacchi, C. (2000). Policy as discourse: What does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse*, 21(1), 45-57.

Dahler-Larsen. (2006). *Evalueringskultur - et begreb bliver til*. [Evaluation culture - A concept emerges]. Odense, Denmark: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut. (2004). *Undervisningsdifferentiering i folkeskolen* [Differentiated teaching in schools]. Copenhagen: Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). From 'separate but equal' to 'no child left behind': The collision of new standards and old inequities. In D. Meier & G. Woods (Eds.), *Many children left behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is damaging our children and our school*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 3-32.

De Coninck-Smith, N., Rosén Rasmussen, L., & Vyuff, I. (2015). *Da skolen blev alles - Tiden efter 1970*. Dansk skolehistorie, bind 5. [When the school became for everyone - The time after 1970. The Danish school history, volume 5]. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Egelund, N. (2000). Country briefing: Special education in Denmark. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 15(1), 88-98.

Engsig, T. T., & Johnstone, C. J. (2015). Is there something rotten in the state of Denmark? The paradoxical policies of inclusive education - Lessons from Denmark. *International Policies of Inclusive Education*, 19(5), 469-486. Foucault, M. (1980). 'The confession of the flesh', interview. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge selected interviews and other writings (1972-1977)*. London: Pantheon Books, pp. 194-228. Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfuss & P. Rabinow (Eds.),

Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-226. Foucault, M. (1984). The means of correct training. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon, pp. 188-205.

Gallagher, D. J. (2001). Neutrality as a moral standpoint, conceptual confusion and the full inclusion debate. *Disability & Society*, 16(5), 637-654.

Graham, C., & Neu, D. (2004). Standardized testing and the construction of governable persons. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(3), 295-319.

Hacking, I. (2004). Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between discourse in the abstract and face-to-face interaction. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 277-302.

Hamre, B. (2012). *Potentialitet og optimering i skolen [Potentiality and Optimization in School]*. Ph.D thesis. Institute for Uddannelse og Pædagogik, Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus Universitet.

Holloway, J. (2017). Risky teachers: Mitigating risk through high-stakes teacher evaluation in the USA. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1-13. DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2017.1322938.

Hunt, P. F. (2011). Salamanca statement and IDEA 2004: Possibilities of practice for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15(4), 461-476.

Kousholt, K., & Hamre, B. (2016). Testing and school reform in Danish education: An analysis informed by the use of 'the dispositive'. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 231-247.

Langager, S. (2014). Children and youth in behavioural and emotional difficulties, skyrocketing diagnosis and inclusion/exclusion processes in school tendencies in Denmark. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 19(3), 284-295.

Ministry of Education. (2012). L 103 Forslag til lov om ændring af lov om folkeskolen, lov om friskoler og private grundskoler m.v. og lov om folkehøjskoler, efterskoler, husholdningsskoler og håndarbejdsskoler (frie kostskoler), § 1. [L 103 Proposal for a law amending the Act on primary and lower secondary schools, the law on schools and private primary schools, etc. and the law on folk high schools, post-primary schools, household schools and craft schools (free boarding schools)]. Copenhagen: Folketinget [The Parliament]. Available at <http://www.ft.dk/samling/2011/lovforslag/L103/index.htm>.

Moos, L. (2014). Educational governance in Denmark. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 13(4), 424-443.

Pedersen, O. K. (2011). *Konkurrencestaten [The Competition State]* Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Porter, T. (1996). Making things quantitative. In M. Power (Ed.), *Accounting and science: Natural inquiry and commercial reason*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Ch. 2.

Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Regeringen [The Government]. (2013). *Alle skal med - Målsætninger for de mest udsatte frem mod 2020* [Everyone Has to Go - Objectives for the most vulnerable to 2020]. Copenhagen: Regeringen. Available at www.stm.dk/multimedia/Alle_skal_med_-_M_ls_tninger_for_de_mest_udsatte_frem_mod_2020.pdf

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2015). Governing by numbers: Audit culture, rankings and the new world order. *Social Anthropology*, 23(1), 22-28. Tetler, S. (2000). *Den inkluderende skole - fra vision til virkelighed* [The inclusive school - From vision to reality]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Tetler, S. (2015). Inklusion - som teoretisk begreb og pragmatisk bestræbelse [Inclusion - as theoretic concept and pragmatic effort]. In B. Pedersen (Ed.), *Perspektiver på inklusion* [Perspectives on Inclusion], special issue of the journal: *Cursiv*, 17.

US Department of Education. (2016). Annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, selected Years, 1979 through 2006; and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) database. National Center for Education Statistics, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary. Retrieved from www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/state-level-data-files/index.html#bcc

Walton, W. T. Department of Educational Psychology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA and Department of Educational Research and Special Education, Malmo School of Education Lund University, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden, Rosenqvist, J. Department of Educational Psychology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA and Department of Educational Research and Special Education, Malmo School of Education Lund University, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden & Sandling, I. Department of Educational Psychology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, USA and Department of Educational Research and Special Education, Malmo School of Education Lund University, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden. (1989). A comparative study of special education contrasting

Denmark, Sweden, and the United States of America.
Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 33(4),
283-298. Walton Brigham Young University, Professor of
Special Education, Department of Educational Psychology,
Provo, Utah 84602, USA, W. T., Emanuelsson, I. University
of Göteborg, Professor of Special Education, Department of
Education, Box 1010, S-431 26 Mölndal, Sweden &
Rosenqvist, J. Associate Professor of Special Education,
Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Lund
University - Malmö School of Education, Box 23501, S-200
45 Malmö, Sweden. (1990). Normalization and integration of
handicapped students into the regular education system:
contrasts between Sweden and the United States of America.
European Journal of Special Needs Education, 5(2), 111-125.

8 School development and inclusion in England and Germany

Apple, M. (2008). Foreword. In J. Allan & R. Slee (Eds.), *Doing inclusive education research*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Ball, S. (2007). *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London and New York: Routledge.

Becker, U. (2015). *Die Inklusionslüge: Behinderung im flexiblen Kapitalismus*. Bielefeld: Verlag.

Bellenberg, G., & Reintjes, C. (2014). Studie zur nordrhein-westfälischen Bildungspolitik 2010-2015. In NRW, GEW (Hrsg.), *Bildungspolitik in NRW: Bochumer Memorandum 2010- 2015. Eine Zwischenbilanz*. Essen: Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft NordrheinWestfalen, pp. 1-38.

Bielefeldt, H. (2006). Opening statement: Dialogue on globalization. Retrieved from <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/global/04664.pdf>

Bielefeldt, H. (2012). Zum Innovationspotenzial der UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention, 1-19. Zugriff. Retrieved from www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de/fileadmin/user_upload/

Björklund, A., Clark, M., Edin, P., & Fredriksson, P. (2005). *The market comes to Sweden: An evaluation of Sweden's surprising school reforms*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Böhlmark, A., & Lindahl, M. (2008). Does school privatization improve educational achievement? Evidence from Sweden's voucher reform. IZA Discussion Paper No. 3691.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *The index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education.

Brantlinger, E. (2006). The big glossies: How textbooks structure (special) education. In E. Brantlinger (Ed.), *Who benefits from special education? Remediating (fixing) other people's children*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 45-76.

Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. (2011). *Unser Weg in eine inklusive Gesellschaft*. Der Nationale

Aktionsplan der Bundesregierung zur Umsetzung der UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention. Retrieved from www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/a740-

Centre for Studies in Education. (2005). News Digest, June. Retrieved 5 July 2006, from <http://inclusion.uwe.ac.uk/csie/june05.htm>

Cramer, C., & Harant, M. (2014). Inklusion – Interdisziplinäre kritik und perspektiven von Begriff und Gegenstand. Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 17(4), 639-659.

Dederich, M. (2014). Heterogeneity, radical otherness and the discourse of inclusive education – A philosophical reflection. In F. Kiuppis & R. S. Haustätter (Eds.), Inclusive education twenty years after Salamanca. New York: Peter Lang.

Department of Education. (1978). Report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department for Education. (2011). Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability. London: The Stationary Office.

Department for Education. (2012). The Green Paper on special needs and disability. SN/SP/5917. House of Commons Library. Retrieved 10 July 2013, from www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05917

Drieschner, E (2014). Herausforderungen inklusiver Schul- und Unterrichtsentwicklung. Eine analyse aus systemtheoretischer perspektive. In E. Drieschner & D. Gaus (Eds.), Das Bildungssystem und seine strukturellen Kopplungen. Umweltbeziehungen des Bildungssystems aus historischer, systematischer und empirischer Perspektive. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp. 217-239.

Dyson, A. (2001). Special needs in the twenty-first century: Where we've been and where we're going. British Journal of Special Education, 28(1), 24-29.

Ellger-Rüttgardt, S. (2008). Geschichte der sonderpädagogik. Eine einföhrung. Munich: Ernst Reinhardt.

European Union. (n.d.). Pathways to inclusion. Retrieved 17 December 2016, from www.includ-ed.eu/good-practice/pathways-inclusion-p2i

Ferri, B. (2012). Undermining inclusion? A critical reading of Response to Intervention (RTI). International Journal of

Inclusive Education, 16(8), 863-880. Gillborn, D., & Youdell, D. (2000). Rationing education: Policy, practice, reform and equity. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Haug, P. (2006). Formulation and realization of social justice: The compulsory school for all in Sweden and Norway. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 14(3), 231-239.

Heinrich, M., Arndt, A., & Werning, R. (2014). Von 'Förderanten' und 'Gymnasialempfehlungskindern'. Professionelle Identitätsbehauptung von Sonderpädagog/innen in der inklusiven Schule. *Zeitschrift für interpretative Schul- und Unterrichtsforschung*, 3, 48-71.

Herz, B. (2014). Pädagogik bei Verhaltensstörungen: An den Rand gedrängt? *Zeitschrift für Heilpädagogik*, 65(1), 4-14.

House of Commons Education and Skills Committee. (2006). Third report. Retrieved 10 July 2013, from

House of Commons Education and Skills Committee. (2011). Fifth report. Retrieved 10 July 2013, from

Klemm, K. (2013). Inklusion in Deutschland - Eine bildungsstatistische analyse. Zugriff. Retrieved 9 October 2015, from www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bildung/Studie_Inklusion_Klemm_2013.pdf

Klieme, E., Sälzer, C., Köller, O., & Prenzel, M. (2013). PISA 2012. Fortschritte und herausforderungen in Deutschland. Berlin: Waxmann.

Kultusministerkonferenz, Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. (2011). Inklusive eildung von kindern und jugendlichen mit behinderungen in schulen. Retrieved 1 July 2015, from www.kmk.org/fileadmin/

Kultusministerkonferenz, Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. (2012). Statistische Veröffentlichungen der Kultusministerkonferenz. Dokument Nr. 196 - Februar 2012. Sonderpädagogische Förderung in Schulen 2001 bis 2010. Retrieved from www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/Statistik/KomStat/Dokumentation_SoPaeFoe_2010.pdf

Kultusministerkonferenz, Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Bundesrepublik

Deutschland. (2014). Statistische Veröffentlichungen der Kultusministerkonferenz. Dokument Nr. 202-Februar 2012. Sonderpädagogische Förderung in Schulen 2003 bis 2012. Retrieved from www.kmk.org/fileadmin/pdf/Statistik/Dokumentationen/Dokumentation_SoPaeFoe_2012.pdf

Nordrhein-Westfalen, Landesregierung. (2012). Aktionsplan der Landesregierung. Eine Gesellschaft für alle. Retrieved from www.mais.nrw.de/08_PDF/003/121115_endfassung_nrwinklusive.pdf

Nordrhein-Westfalen, Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes. (2014). Sonderausgabe Inklusion. Retrieved 1 July 2015, from www.schulministerium.nrw.de/docs/Schulsystem/Inklusion/

Nordrhein-Westfalen, Schulministerium. (2014). Schulgesetz für das Land Nordrhein-Westfalen (Schulgesetz NRW-SchulG). Retrieved 13 July 2013, from www.schulministerium.nrw.de/docs/Recht/Schulrecht/Schulgesetz/Schulgesetz.pdf

Persson, B. (2006). Inclusive education in the Nordic welfare state: Obstacles, dilemmas and opportunities. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Geneva, 11-15 September.

Pfahl, L., & Seitz, S. (2014). Begabung und traditionen. In A. Hackl, C. Imhof, & O. Steenbuck (Eds.), Karg Hefte: Beiträge zur Begabtenförderung und Begabungsforschung. Frankfurt/ Main: Karg-stiftung, pp. 46-57.

Pugach, M., & Blanton, L. (2009). A framework for conducting research on collaborative teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(4), 575-582.

Reich, K. (2012). Inklusion und Bildungsgerechtigkeit: Standards und regeln zur umsetzung einer inklusiven schule. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz Verlag.

Schroeder, J. (2010). Die Schule für alle - überall? Rückfragen zum Hamburger Schulversuch 'Integrative grundschule im sozialen brennpunkt'. In J. Schwohl & T. Sturm (Eds.), Inklusion als herausforderung schulischer entwicklung. Widersprüche und perspektiven eines erziehungswissenschaftlichen diskurses. Transcript: Bielefeld, pp. 119-138.

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. *International*

Journal of Sociology of Education, 11(2), 173-191.

Slee, R., & Weiner, G. (2011). Education reform and reconstruction as a challenge to research genres: Reconsidering school effectiveness research and inclusive schooling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 12(1), 83-98.

Sturm, T. (2016). Von der sonderpädagogik zur inklusiven pädagogik - Phasen der entwicklung inklusiver bildung. In I. Hedderich et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch inklusion und sonderpädagogik*. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany/Obb.: Klinkhardt, pp. 179-183.

Sturm, T., & Wagner-Willi, M. (2016). Kooperation pädagogischer Professionen: Bearbeitung und Herstellung von Differenz in der integrativen Sekundarstufe. In A. Kreis et al. (Eds.), *Kooperation im Kontext schulischer Heterogenität*. Munich and Berlin: Waxmann.

Thomas, G. (2007). Theory and the construction of pathology. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York, 24-28 March.

Tomlinson, S. (2012). The irresistible rise of the SEN industry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(3), 267-286.

Training and Development Agency. (2012). ITT Trainees: The pillars of inclusion. Inclusive teaching and learning for pupils with special educational needs (SEN) and/or disabilities. Training toolkit. Retrieved 9 July 2016, from www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/Teacher-

United Nations. (2006). Übereinkommen über die Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen (dreisprachige Fassung im Bundesgesetzblatt Teil II Nr. 35 vom 31.12.2008). (Manuskriptdruck). Retrieved from www.bgbl.de/xaver/bgbl/start.xav?startbk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBl&landbk=Bundesanzeiger_BGBl&start=//%255B@attr_id=%2527bgbl208s1419.pdf%2527%255D-%252F%2F%255B%2527bgbl208s1419.pdf%27%5D__1436680810555

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization/Ministry of Education and Science Spain. (1994). The Salamanca statement and framework for action. Retrieved 8 July 2013, from www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF

Voß, L. (2013). Die Konzepte 'Kompetenzzentren für sonderpädagogische förderung' und 'Regionale Integrationskonzepte' als wegbereiter für inklusion. Eine qualitative untersuchung. In R. Werning & A-K. Arndt (Eds.), Inklusion: Kooperation und unterricht entwickeln. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 63-85.

Warnock, M. (2010). Special educational needs: A new look. In L. Terzi (Ed.), Special educational needs: A new look. London: Continuum, pp. 11-45.

9 Inclusion as a right and an obligation in a neoliberal society

Bjørnsrud, H., & Nilsen, S. (2011). The development of intentions for adapted teaching and inclusive education seen in light of curriculum potential: A content analysis of Norwegian national curricula post 1980. *Curriculum Journal*, 22(4), 549-566. Bjørnsrud, H., & Nilsen, S. (2014). Early educational provision - Emphasised in education policy reforms in Norway? Analyses of education policy documents. *Curriculum Journal*, 25(2), 260-281. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2004). *Index for inclusion*. Bristol: Centre for Inclusive Studies in Education. Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughan, M., & Shaw, L. (2000). *Index for inclusion*. Bristol: Centre for Inclusive Studies in Education. Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Clarke, C., Dyson, A., & Millward, A. (Eds.). (1998). *Theorizing special education*. London: Routledge. Danish Institute for Local and Regional Government Research. (2017). *Bedre veje til ungdomsuddannelse, Kompetencer og implementering i forberedende tilbud*. Retrieved from www.kora.dk.

Ekspertgruppen. (2017): *Bedre veje til ungdomsuddannelse*. Retrieved from www.uvm.dk.

Evans, L., & Lunt, I. (2005). Inclusive education - Are there limits? In K. Topping & S. Maloney (Eds.), *Inclusive education*. London: Routledge, pp. 41-55.

Farrell, P. (2001). Special education in the last twenty years: Have things really got better? *British Journal of Special Education*, 0(29), 3-9.

Florian, L. (2005). Inclusive practice: What, why and how? In K. Topping & S. Maloney (Eds.), *Inclusive education*. London: Routledge, pp. 29-41.

Goffman, E. (2014). *Stigma*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

Hansen, J. H. (2012). Limits to Inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(1), 89-98.

Hansen, J. H., Andersen, B. B., Højholt, A., Morin, A. (2014). *Afdækning af forskning og viden i relation til ressourcepersoner og teamsamarbejde*. (Review of Research and Knowledge in relation to Educators and Teamwork). The Danish Ministry of Education.

Hansen, J. H. (2015). Uddannelse som vejen til inklusion. (Education as a Pathway to Inclusion). In R. Jensen et al. (Eds.), Udsatte børn og unge - en grundbog. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels.

Hansen, J. H. (2016). Social imaginaries and inclusion. In M. A. Peters (Eds.), Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory. Singapore: Springer, pp. 1-6.

Hansen, J. V. (1998): Det nye sociale spørgsmål (The new Social Question). In A. Greve (Eds.), Sociologien om velfærd (The Sociology of Welfare). Roskilde. Roskilde Universitets Forlag.

Hilt, L. T. (2016). 'They don't know what it means to be a student': Inclusion and exclusion in the nexus between 'global' and 'local'. Policy Futures of Education, 14(6), 666-686.

Jenkins, R. (2000). Categorisation: Identity, social process and epistemology. Current Sociology, 48(3), 7-25.

Kousholt, K., & Hamre, B. (2016). Testing and school reform in Danish education: An analysis informed by the use of 'the dispositive'. In W. C. Smith (Eds.), The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 231-247.

Kristensen, J. E. (2012). Viljen til inklusion, (The Will to Inclusion). Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift, 4.

Laclau, E. (1996). Deconstruction, pragmatism, hegemony. In C. Mouffe (Eds.), Deconstruction and pragmatism. London: Routledge, pp. 47-67.

Langager, S. (2014): Specialpædagogikkens børn (The Children and Special Education). In K. Illeris (Eds.), Læring i konkurrencestaten (Education in the competition state). Copenhagen. Samfundlitteratur.

Lazowski, R. A., & Hulleman, C. S. (2016). Motivation interventions in educations: A metaanalytic review. Review of Educational Research, 86(2), 160-171.

Lillejord, S., Halvorsrud, K., Ruud, E., Morgan, K., Freyr, T., Fischer-Griffiths, P., Eikeland, O. J., Hauge, T. E., Homme, A. D., & Manger, T. (2015). Frafall i videregående opplæring: En systematisk kunnskapsoversikt. Oslo: Kunnskapssenter for utdanning. Retrieved from www.kunnskapssenter.no,

www.forskningsradet.no/servlet/Satellite?c=Rapport&cid=1254008808778&pagename=kunnskapssenter/Hovedsidemal.

Ministry of Education. (2016). Education Act. Retrieved from <https://uvm.dk/folkeskolen/folkeskolens-maal-love-og-regler>

Nilsen, S. (2010). Moving towards an educational policy for inclusion? Main reform stages in the development of the Norwegian unitary school system. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(5), 479-497.

Nilsen, S. (2017). Special education and general education – Coordinated or separated? A study of curriculum planning for pupils with special educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(2), 205-217. Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (2009). 18. Rett til læring (Right to learning). Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). Tiltak for bedre gjennomføring i videregående opplæring. Rapport. Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. (2012). Strategy for lower secondary education in Norway. Retrieved from www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kd/vedlegg/grunnskole/strategiplaner/f_4276_e_web.pdf Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. (2015). Official Norwegian Reports NOU 2015:8: The school of the future: Renewal of subjects and competences. Retrieved from www.regjeringen.no.

Topping, K., & Maloney, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Inclusive education*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-15. Union of Education Norway. (2009). Frafall for fagopplæring – slik yrkesfaglærere ser det. (Dropouts in vocational education and training – Such vocational teachers see it). Wilson, S. J., Tanner-Smith, E. E., Lipsey, M. W., Steinka-Fry, K., & Morrison, J. (2011). Dropout prevention and intervention programs: Effects on school completion and dropout among school-aged children and youth. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 8. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1140140123?accountid=163439>.

10 Refugee education: conceptualizing inclusion amid conflict and crisis

Francis, A. (2015). Jordan's refugee crisis: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved from

Global Business Coalition for Education. (2017). Mission. Retrieved from <http://gbc-education.org/mission/>

Human Rights Watch. (2016). When I picture my future, I see nothing: Barriers to education for Syrian refugee children in Turkey. Retrieved from www.hrw.org/report/2015/11/08/

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2009). Education in emergencies: Including everyone - INEE pocket guide to inclusive education. Retrieved from <http://toolkit.ineesite.org/>

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2017). Tools and resources. Retrieved from www.ineesite.org/

Jusoor. (2017). Programs. Retrieved from <http://jusoorsyria.com/#programs>

Karam Foundation. (2016). Displaced generation: The landscape of refugee education in Syria, Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon. Retrieved from <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/>

Keddie, A. (2012). Refugee education and justice issues of representation, redistribution and recognition. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 42(2), 197-212.

Khawaja, B., Martinez, E., & van Esveld, B. (2017). The lost years: Secondary education for children in emergencies. Human Rights Watch World Report 2017. Retrieved from www.hrw.org/world-report/2017

McPherson, M. (2014). Refugee women, representation and education: Creating a discourse of selfauthorship and potential. London: Routledge.

Menashy, F., & Zakharia, Z. (2017). Investing in the crisis: Private participation in the education of Syrian refugees. Brussels: Education International.

Mendenhall, M., Garnett Russell, S., & Buckner, E. (2017). Urban refugee education: Strengthening policies and practices for access, quality and inclusion. New York:

Columbia University Teachers College. Retrieved from [www.tc.columbia.edu/ media/centers/refugee-](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/media/centers/refugee-)

Nicolai, S., & Hine, S. (2015). Investment for education in emergencies: A review of evidence. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Overseas Development Institute. (2016). Education cannot wait: Proposing a fund for education in emergencies. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Oxford Dictionaries. (2017). Definition of logistics in English. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/logistics>

Segal, U., & Mayadas, N. (2005). Assessment of issues facing immigrant and refugee families. Child Welfare, 84(5), 563-583.

Sinclair, M. (2002). Planning education in and after emergencies. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Slee, R. (2011). The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education. London: Routledge.

Slee, R. (2014). Discourses of inclusion and exclusion: Drawing wider margins. Power and Education, 6(1), 7-17.

Taylor, S., & Sidhu, R. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16(1), 39-56.

United Nations Children's Fund. (2014). All in school: Middle East and North Africa out-of-school children initiative. Amman, Jordan: UNICEF MENA. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2005). Education for all: The quality imperative. Paris: UNESCO. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2013). Education transforms lives. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002231/223115E.pdf> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). Humanitarian aid for education: Why it matters and why more is needed. Education for All Global Monitoring Report (EFA GMR). Policy Paper 21. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002335/233557E.pdf> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016a). Institute for Statistics. Retrieved from <http://data.uis.unesco.org/>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016b). No more excuses: Provide education for all forcibly displaced people. Working Paper 26. Retrieved from <http://en.unesco.org/gem-report/no-more-excuses> United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016c). UNESCO Global education monitoring report 2016. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2012). Education strategy 2012-2016. Retrieved from www.unhcr.org/5149ba349 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2013). The future of Syria: Refugee children in crisis. Retrieved from

World Bank. (2013). Lebanon: Economic and social impact assessment of the Syrian conflict. Report No. 81098-LB. Retrieved from www.arabstates.undp.org/content/dam/rbas/doc/

Section essay: Testing inclusive education?

Ball, S. J. (2013). *The education debate*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bauman, Z. (2004). *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor & Francis. Biklen, D. (1985). *Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, K., & Fulcher, G. (1984). *Integration in Victorian education: Ministerial review of educational services for the disabled*. Melbourne: Ministry of Education, Victorian Government Printer.

Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped. (1978). *Special educational needs: Report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people*. (The Warnock Report). London: H.M.S.O.

Deloitte Access Economics (2017). *Review of education for students with disability in Queensland state schools*. Brisbane: Department of Education and Training. Retrieved 23 March 2018: 12.18am AEDST, from

Department for Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (2012). *Review of disability standards for education 2005 Report for Department for Education, Employment and Workplace Relations*. Canberra: Australian Government Printer. Retrieved from

Department of Education and Training. (2016). *Review of the program for students with disabilities* (Chair: Graeme Innes), Melbourne, Department of Education and Training, Retrieved 2 November 2017, from www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/about/department/PSD-Review-Report.pdf.

Fulcher, G. (1989). *Integrate or mainstream? Comparative issues in the politics of these issues*. In L. Barton (Ed.), *Integration: myth or reality?* Lewes: Falmer Press, pp. 6-29.

Gamoran, A. (2010). *Tracking and inequality: New directions for research and practice*. In M. W. Apple, S. J. Ball, &

L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education*. Milton Park: Routledge, pp. 213-228.

Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* London: Routledge.

Gillborn, D., & Youdell, D. (1999). *Rationing education: Policy, practice, reform, and equity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Harwood, V., & Allan, J. (2014). *Psychopathology at school, theorizing mental disorders in education*. London: Routledge. Hornby, G. (2014). *Inclusive special education: evidence-based practices for children with special needs and disabilities*. New York: Springer. Lingard, B., Thompson, G., & Sellar, S. (Eds.). (2016). *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment*. Abingdon: Routledge. Messiou, K. (2017). Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(2), 146-159. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.com.

Slee, R. (1998). High reliability organizations and liability students. In R. Slee, G. Weiner, & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School effectiveness for whom? Challenges to the school effectiveness and school improvement movements*. London: Falmer Press.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education*. London: Routledge.

Stobart, G. (2008). *Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment*. London: Routledge.

Teese, R. (2000). *Academic success and social power: Examinations and inequality*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press. Tomlinson, S. (2017). *A sociology of special and inclusive education: Exploring the manufacture of inability*. Abingdon: Routledge. United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. New York: United Nations. Retrieved on 23rd March 2018 at 12:28am AEDST, from <https://www.un.org/>

11 Inclusion: the Cinderella concept in educational policy in Latin America

Amadio, M. (2009). La educación inclusiva en América Latina y el Caribe: Un análisis exploratorio de los Informes Nacionales presentados a la Conferencia Internacional de Educación de 2008 [Education in Latin America and the Caribbean: An exploratory analysis of the National Reports presented to the 2008 International Conference on Education].

Armstrong, D., Armstrong, A. C., & Spandagou, I. (2010). Inclusive education: International policy and practice. London: Routledge.

Barton, L. (Ed.) (1987). The politics of special educational needs. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (Formerly: Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education), 21(1), 33-46.

Biesta, G. (2014). ¿Medir lo que valoramos o valorar lo que medimos? Globalización, responsabilidad y la noción de propósito de la educación. [Measuring what we Value or Valuing what we Measure? Globalization, Accountability and the Question of Educational Purpose.] Pensamiento Educativo. Revista Educacional Latinoamericana, 51(1), 46-57. Brantlinger, E. (1997) Using ideology: cases of non-recognition of the politics of research and practice in special education. Review of Educational Research, 67, 425-459. Education Assessment | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (s. f.).

PISA 2012 Results: Excellence through equity: Giving every student the chance to succeed (Vol. II, p. 59). Paris: OECD Publishing. Porter, T. M. (1996). Trust in numbers: The pursuit of objectivity in science and public life. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Questions & Answers | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (s. f.).

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11(2), 173-192. Slee, R. (2013). How do we make inclusive education happen when exclusion is a political predisposition? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 17(8), 895-907, DOI:

10.1080/13603116.2011.602534. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Salamanca Statement. (s. f.).
http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF Thompson, J. B. (1984). *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Tomlinson, S. (1996). Conflicts and dilemmas for professionals in special education, In C. Christensen & F. Rizvi (Eds.). *Disability and the Dilemmas of Education and Justice*. Buckingham: Open University Press. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Education Assessment. (n.d.). Retrieved 9 January 2017, from www.unesco.org/new/en/santiago/education/education-assessment-llece/ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015a). *Logros de Aprendizaje. Informe de Resultados del Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo [Learning Achievement: Results Report of the Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study]*, TERCE. Santiago, Chile. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015b). *Factores Asociados. Informe de Resultados del Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo [Associated Factors. Results Report of the Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study]*, TERCE. Santiago, Chile. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization - Oficina Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe. (2016). *Reporte Técnico: Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo [Technical Report. Third Regional Comparative and Explanatory Study]*, TERCE. Santiago, Chile.

12 Psychiatric testing and everyday school life: collaborative work with diagnosed children

Axel, E. (2002). Regulation as productive tool use - P anticipatory observation in the control room of a district heating system. Frederiksberg: Roskilde University Press.

Benning, T. B. (2015): Limitations of the biopsychosocial model in psychiatry. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 6, 347-352.

Biesta, G. (2012). Giving teaching back to education: Responding to the disappearance of the teacher. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6(2), 35-49.

Black-Hawkins, K., & Florian, L. (2012). Classroom teachers' craft knowledge of their inclusive practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18(5), 567-584.

Borg, T. (2003). Livsførelse i hverdagen under rehabilitering. Et socialpsykologisk studie [The conduct of life under rehabilitation. A social psychological study]. Aarhus, Denmark: Center for Health, Humanity and Culture, University of Aarhus.

Cohen, C. I. (2000). Overcoming social amnesia: The role for a social perspective in psychiatric research and practice. *Psychiatric Services*, 51(1), 72-78.

Cole, M., & Engeström, Y. (1993). A cultural-historical approach to distributed cognition. In G. Salomon (Eds.), *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

DeWalt, K. M., & DeWalt, B. R. (2002). Participant observation - A guide for fieldworkers. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Dreier, O. (1999). Personal trajectories of participation across contexts of social practice. *Outlines*, 1(1), 5-32.

Dreier, O. (2003). Subjectivity and social practice. Aarhus, Denmark: Center for Health, Humanity and Culture, University of Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.

Dreier, O. (2008). Psychotherapy in everyday life - Learning in doing: Social, cognitive, & computational perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, A. (2011). Building common knowledge at the boundaries between professional practice: Relational agency and relational expertise in systems of distributed expertise. *International Journal of Education Research*, 50(1), 33-39.

Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J., & Warmington, P. (2009). *Improving interprofessional collaborations: Multi-agency working for children's wellbeing*. London: Routledge.

Ekström, P. (2004). *Makten att definiera*. [The power to define]. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Emanuelsson, I., Persson, B., & Rosenqvist, J. (2001). *Forskning inom det specialpedagogiska området - en kunskaps översikt*. [Research on special education - A review]. Stockholm: Leanders Tryckeri.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(5), 813-828.

Hedegaard-Sørensen, L. (2013). *Inkluderende specialpædagogik - procesdidaktik og situeret professionalisme i undervisningssituationer* [Inclusive education - Didactic reasoning and situated professionalism]. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Hedegaard-Sørensen, L., & Tetler, S. (2011). Situated professionalism in special educational practice, *Educating pre-service teachers for special education/inclusive education*. In M. Mattsson, D. Rorrison, & T. Eilertsen (Eds.), *A practicum turn in teacher education*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Hedegaard-Sørensen, L., & Tetler, S. (2016). Evaluating the quality of learning environments and teaching practice in special schools. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, published online. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1141524>

Højholt, C. (2011). Cooperation between professionals in educational psychology: Children's specific problems are connected to general problems in relation to taking part. In H. Daniels & M. Hedegaard (Eds.), *Vygotsky and special needs education: Rethinking support for children and schools*. London: Continuum Press.

Højholt, C. (2016). *Child, families and communities:*

Introducing reflections. In M. Fleer & B. V. Oers (Eds.),
International handbook of early childhood education.
Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Springer.

Højholt, C., & Kousholt, D. (2009). Researching conduct of
everyday life across children's life contexts. Paper
presented at the ISTP conference, Nanjing, China, 15-19 May
2009.

Højholt, C., & Kousholt, D. (2014). Participant observation
of children's communities: Exploring subjective aspects of
social practice. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(3),
316-334.

Holzkamp, K. (1998). Daglig livsførelse som
subjektvidenskabelig grundkategori [Conduct of life as a
basic concept in the science of the subject]. *Nordiske
udkast*, 26(2), 3-31.

Holzkamp, K. (2013). Psychology: Social self-understanding
on the reasons for action in the conduct of everyday life.
In E. Scraube & U. Osterkamp (Eds.), *Psychology from the
standpoint of the subject: Selected writings of Klaus
Holzkamp*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Juul Jensen, U.
(1986). Sygdomsbegreber i praksis - Det kliniske arbejdes
filosofi og videnska bsteori [Concepts of illness in
practice - Philosophy of the clinical work]. Copenhagen:
Munksgaard.

Kecmanovis, D. (2011). Controversies and dilemmas in
contemporary psychiatry. London: Transaction Publishes.

Lave, J. (1985). The social organization of knowledge and
practice: A symposium. *Anthropology and Education
Quarterly*, 16(3), 171-176.

Lave, J. (1996). The practice of learning. In S. Chaiklin &
J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding practice - Perspectiv es on
activity and context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning -
Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge
University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (2005). Practice, person, social
world. In H. Daniels (Eds.), *An introduction to Vygotsky*.
New York: Routledge. Morin, A. (2007). Børns deltagelse og
læring - på tværs af almen- og specialpædagogiske
lærearrangementer [Childrens participation and learning -
Across learning arrangements of general and special

education]. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Education, Aarhus University. Morin, A. (2015). Children's conduct of life - Across general school, educational psychology consultation and psychiatry. *Nordic Psychology*, 67(3), 225-240. Norwich, B. (2013). Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education, living with uncertainty. London: Routledge. Polkinghorne, D. E. (2004). Practice of the human sciences - The case for a judgement-based practice of care. New York: State University of New York Press. Rasmussen, O. V. (2001). Om udforskning af pædagogisk psykologisk rådgivning - mod et børneperspektiv [Researching school psychology - Towards a child perspective]. *Psykologisk Pædagogisk Rådgivning*, 38(4), 263-283. Shakespeare, T. (2013). Disability - Rights and wrongs revisited. New York: Routledge.

13 Development of a formative assessment system within a cross-cultural context (MANGO)

Al Otaiba, S., & Hosp, M. (2004). Service learning: Training preservice teachers to provide effective literacy instruction to students with Down syndrome. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 36(4), 28-35.

Allor, J. H., Mathes, P., Roberts, K., Cheatham, J. P., & Al Otaiba, S. (2014). Is scientificallybased reading instruction effective for students with below-average IQs? *Exceptional Children*, 80(3), 287-306.

Amnesty International. (2015). Must try harder ethnic discrimination of Romani children in Czech schools. London: Amnesty International, International Secretariat.

Browder, D. M., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Courtade, G., Gibbs, S. L., & Flo wers, C. (2008). Evaluation of the effectiveness of an early literacy program for students with significant developmental disabilities. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 75(1), 33-52.

Browder, D. M., Gibbs, S., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Courtade, G., & Lee, A. (2017). Early Literacy Skills Builder (ELSB) for older students. Verona, WI: Attainment Company. Browder, D. M., & Minar ovic, T. (2000). Utilizing sight words in self-instruction training for employees with moderate mental retardation in competitive jobs. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 35, 78-89.

Browder, D. M., Wakeman, S. Y., Spooner, F., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., & Algozzine, B. (2006). Research on reading instruction for individuals with significant cognitive disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 72, 392-408.

Chall, J. S. (1996). *Stages of reading development*, 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. *Exceptional Children*, 52, 219-232.

Deno, S. L. (1992). The nature and development of curriculum-based measurement: Preventing school failure. *Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 36(2), 5-10.

Dever, B. V., Raines, T. C., Dowdy, E., & Hostutler , C. (2016). Addressing disproportionality in special education

using a universal screening approach. *Journal of Negro Education*, 85(1), 59-71.

Discriminate. (2015). In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved 12 April 2017, from www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/discriminate

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title IX, 20 U.S.C. 7801 et seq. Section 9101.

Erickson, K., & K oppenhaver, D. (2007). *Children with disabilities: Reading and writing the Four Blocks way*. Greensboro, NC: Carson-Dellosa Publishing.

Espin, C., Wallace, T., Campbell, H., Lembke, E., Long, J., & Ticha, R. (2008). Curriculumbased measurement in writing: Predicting the success of high-school students on state standards tests. *Exceptional Children*, 74(2), 174-194.

Every Student Succeeds Act S. 1177-1114th Congress. Retrieved from www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/s1177

Foegen, A., & Deno , S. L. (2001). Identifying growth indicators for low-achieving students in middle school mathematics. *Journal of Special Education*, 35(1), 4-16.

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2002). Mathematical problem-solving profiles of students with mathematics disabilities with and without comorbid reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(6), 563-574.

Giangreco, M. F., & Suter , J. C. (2015). Precarious or purposeful? Proactively building inclusive special education service delivery on solid ground. *Inclusion*, 3(3), 112-131. Gontmakher, E. et al. (2009). Russia: On the path to equal opportunities. UN Office in the Russian Federation. Moscow. Retrieved from www.unrussia.ru/publications/russia_on_the_pat_en.pdf Grigorenko, E. L. (1998). Russian 'defectology' anticipating Perestroika in the field. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31(2), 193-207. Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge, pp. 206-207.

Hoffman, J. V. (2012). Standpoints: Why EGRA - a clone of DIBELS - will fail to improve literacy in Africa. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 46(4), 340-357.

Howard, S. J., Woodcock, S., Ehrich, J., & Bokosmaty, S. (2017). What are standardized literacy and numeracy tests testing? Evidence of the domain-general contributions to students' standardized educational test performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(1), 108-122.

Koppenhaver, D. A., & Erickson, K. A. (2003). Natural emergent literacy supports for preschoolers with autism and severe communication impairments. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 23, 283-292.

Lovaas, O. I. (1987). Behavioral treatment and normal educational and intellectual functioning in young autistic children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55(1), 3-9.

Mascolo, M. F., & Fischer, K. W. (2004). Constructivist theories. In B. Hopkins et al. (Eds.), *Cambridge encyclopedia of child development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 232-251.

McMaster, K. L., & Espin, C. (2007). Curriculum-based measurement in writing: A literature review. *Journal of Special Education*, 41, 68-84.

Muskin, J. A. (2015). Student learning assessment and the curriculum: Issues and implications for policy, design and implementation. *Current and Critical Issues in the Curriculum and Learning, In-Progress Reflections*, 1, 1-29.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Public Law 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2001).

Restorff, D. E., & Abery, B. H. (2013). Observations of academic instruction for students with significant intellectual disability: Three states, thirty-nine classrooms, one view. *Remedial and Special Education*, 34(5), 282-292.

Restorff, D. E., & Sharpe, M., & Abery, B. H., Rodriguez, M., & Namkeol, K. (2012). Teacher perceptions of alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards: Results from a three-state survey. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*,

Stecker, P. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Using curriculum-based measurement to improve student achievement: Review of research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 795-819.

Stockard, J. (2015). A brief summary of research on direct instruction. Eugene, OR: National Institute of Direct Instruction.

Sullivan, A. L., & Bal, A. (2013). Disproportionality in special education: Effects of individual and school variables on disability risk. *Exceptional Children*, 79(4), 475-494.

Tichá, R., & Abery, B. H. (2015). Beyond the large-scale testing of basic skills: Using formative assessment to facilitate student learning. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 153-169.

Tindal, G., McDonald, M., Tedesco, M., Glasgow, A., Almond, P., & Crawford, L. (2003). Alternate assessments in reading and math: Development and validation for students with significant disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 69, 481-494.

Valeeva, R. A., & Demakova, I. D. (2015). Humanization of Education in the Context of Janusz Korczak Pedagogical Ideas. *Review of European Studies*, 7(4), 161. Vista, A. (2013). The role of reading comprehension in maths achievement growth: Investigating the magnitude and mechanism of the mediating effect on maths achievement in Australian classrooms. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 62, 21-35. Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Wallace, T., & Tichá, R. (2012). Extending curriculum-based measurement to assess performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities: Measure of success. In C. Espin et al. (Eds.), *A measure of success: How curriculum-based measurement has influenced education and learning*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Wallace, T., Tichá, R., & Gustafson, K. (2010). Technical characteristics of general outcome measures (GOMs) in reading for students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 26(4), 333-360. White, J. M. (2012). Pitfalls and bias: Entry testing and the overrepresentation of Romani children in

special education. Budapest, Hungary: Roma Education Fund.

14 The significance of SEN assessment, diagnoses, and psychometric tests in inclusive education: studies from Sweden and Germany

Dederich, M. (2016). Unterstützung durch Dekategorisierung? Eine Replik auf Andreas Hinz und Andreas Köpfer [Support by decategorization? A reply to Andreas Hinz and Andreas Köpfer]. Vierteljahresschrift für Heilpädagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete, 85(1), 48-52. Egelund, N., Haug, P., & Persson, B. (2006). Inkluderande pedagogik i skandinavisk perspektiv [Inclusive pedagogy from a Scandinavian perspective]. Stockholm: Liber. Emanuelsson, I., Persson, B., & Rosenqvist, J. (2001). Forskning inom det specialpedagogiska området: en kunskapsöversikt [Research in the field of special education: A knowledge review]. Stockholm: Statens skolverk.

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. (2012). Special needs education: Country data 2012. Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.

Fleck, L. (1979). Genesis and development of a scientific fact. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Giota, J., & Emanuelsson, I. (2011). Policies in special education support issues in Swedish compulsory school: A national representative study of head teachers' judgements. London Review of Education, 9(1), 95-108.

Heimlich, U. (2016). Pädagogik bei Lernschwierigkeiten [Pedagogy for learning difficulties], 2nd ed. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkhardt.

Hinz, A., & Köpfer, A. (2016). Unterstützung trotz Dekategorisierung? Beispiele für Unterstützung durch Dekategorisierung [Support despite decategorization? Examples of support through decategorization]. Vierteljahresschrift für Heilpädagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete, 85(1), 36-47.

Hjörne, E., & Säljö, R. (2004). The pupil welfare team as a discourse community: Accounting for school problems. Linguistics and Education, 15(4), 321-338. Hjörne, E., & Säljö, R. (2013). Att platsa i en skola för alla: elevhälsa och förhandling om normalitet i den svenska skolan [To qualify in a school for all: Pupil welfare and negotiation of normality in the Swedish school], 4th ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Isaksson, J., Lindqvist, R., & Bergström, E. (2007). School problems or individual shortcomings? A study of individual educational plans in Sweden. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 22(1), 75-91.

Isaksson, J., Lindqvist, R., & Bergström, E. (2010). 'Pupils with special educational needs': A study of the assessments and categorising processes regarding pupils' school difficulties in Sweden. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(2), 133-151.

Kottman, B. (2006). Selektion in die Sonderschule: Das Verfahren zur Feststellung von sonderpädagogischen Förderbedarf als Gegenstand empirischer Forschung [Selection into special school: The assessment procedure of special educational needs as subject of empirical research]. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkhardt.

Lütje-Klose, B., Neumann, P., & Str eese, B. (2017). Schulische Inklusion in NordrheinWestfalen (NRW) – sieben Jahre nach Ratifizierung der UN-BRK [School inclusion in North-Rhine Westphalia (NRW) – seven years after the ratification of the UN CRPD]. *Inklusion Online*. Retrieved 3 September 2017, from www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/416

Mand, J. (2002). Integration oder Sonderschule? Zum Einfluss von Gutachtervariablen auf Förderortempfehlungen [Integration or special school? On the influence of assessors' variables on placement recommendations]. *Zeitschrift für Heilpädagogik*, 53(1), 8-13.

Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. (2017). Sonderpädagogische Förderung in Nordrhein-Westfalen: zusammen lernen, zusammenwachsen. Schule NRW – Zukunft inklusiv! Statistische Daten und Kennziffern zur Inklusion – 2016/17 [Special educational support in North Rhine-Westphalia: learning together, growing together. School NRW – inclusive future! Statistical data and indices for inclusion – 2016/2017]. Statistische Übersicht 396. Düsseldorf. Retrieved 25 October 2017, from www.schule.nrw.de

Morin, A., & Hedegaard-Sørensen, L. (2018). Psychiatric test knowledge and everyday school life – Collaborative work with diagnosed children (This volume). In B. Hamre, A. Morin, & C. Ydesen (Eds.), *Testing and inclusive schooling – International challenges and opportunities*. London: Routledge.

- Norwich, B. (2014). Categories of special educational needs. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of special education*, Vol. 1. London: Sage, pp. 55-71.
- Odenbring, Y., Johansson, T., & Hunehall Berndtsson, K. (2017). The many faces of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Unruly behaviour in secondary school and diagnostic solutions. *Power and Education*, 9(1), 51-64.
- Östlund, D., & Barow, T. (2017). The assessment of special educational needs in Scania, Sweden. Kristianstad University & University of Gothenburg. Unpublished working paper.
- Persson, E. (2013). Raising achievement through inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(11), 1205-1220.
- Pfahl, L., & Powell, J. J. W. (2011). Legitimizing school segregation: The special education profession and the discourse of learning disability in Germany. *Disability & Society*, 26(4), 449-462.
- Prücher, F., & Langfeldt, H.-P. (2002). How German teachers in special education perceive and describe children with a learning disability. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49(4), 399-411. Ricken, G., & Schuck, K. D. (2016). Diagnostik in pädagogischen Kontexten [Diagnostics in pedagogical contexts]. In M. Dederich et al. (Eds.), *Handlexikon der Behindertenpädagogik: Schlüsselbegriffe aus Theorie und Praxis*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp. 347-351.
- Rix, J., Sheehy, K., Fletcher-Campbell, F., Crisp, M., & Harper, A. (2013). Exploring provision for children identified with special educational needs: An international review of policy and practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(4), 375-391.
- Schumann, B. (2007). 'Ich schäme mich ja so!' Die Sonderschule für Lernbehinderte als Schonraumfalle ['I'm so embarrassed!' The special school for pupils with a learning disability as a sheltered environment pitfall]. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkhardt.
- Skolverket. (2017). PM: Särskilt stöd i grundskolan läsåret 2016/17 [Memo: Special needs support in the compulsory school year 2016/17]. Dnr: 2016:1320. Retrieved 6 September 2017, from www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=3779.

Sturm, T. (2016). Phasen der Entwicklung Inklusiver Bildung [Development stages of inclusive education]. In I. Hedderich et al. (Eds.), Handbuch Inklusion und Sonderpädagogik. Bad Heilbrunn, Germany: Klinkhardt, pp. 179-183. Vislie, L. (2003). From integration to inclusion: Focusing global trends and changes in the Western European societies. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 18(1), 17-35.

Voß, S., Blumenthal, Y., Mahlau, K., Marten, K., Diehl, K., Sikora, S., & Hartke, B. (2016). Der Response-to-Intervention-Ansatz in der Praxis: Evaluationsergebnisse zum Rügener Inklusionsmodell [The response-to-intervention approach in practice: evaluation results from the Rügen inclusion model]. Münster: Waxmann.

Section essay: Inclusion and assessment: complicated and complex

Black, P., & William, D. (2005). Lessons learned from around the world: how policies, politics and cultures constrain and afford assessment practices. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 249-261

Cuban, L. (2013). *Inside the black box of classroom practice: Change without reform in American Education*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

EADSNE. (Ed.). (2011). *Participation in inclusive education: A framework for developing indicators*. Odense, Denmark: Author. Florian. (2014) *Reliable data*, In European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (Ed.). *Inclusive Education in Europe: Putting theory into practice*. Proceedings of the International Conference Reflections from Researchers, 18 November 2013, Brussels, pp. 83-93. Available at:

Glossary of Education Reform. (2015). *Assessment*. Retrieved from [http://edglossary.org/ assessment/](http://edglossary.org/assessment/)

Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings - a critical analysis of research on inclusive education, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 265-280.

Hayward, L. (2014). *Assessment for learning and the journey towards inclusion*. In L. Florian (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of special education*, 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications. Kyriazopoulou, M., & Weber, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Development of a set of indicators - for inclusive education in Europe*. Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. Retrieved from www.european-agency.org/agency-projects/indicatorsfor-inclusive-education/indicators-documents/Indicators-EN.pdf. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Equity in education: Students with disabilities, learning difficulties and disadvantages*. Paris: Author. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: Overcoming social background: Equity in learning opportunities and outcomes*. Vol. II. Paris: Author. Schmidt, W. H., Burroughs, N. A., Zoido, P., & Houang, R. T. (2015). *The role of schooling in perpetuating inequality: An international perspective*. *Educational Researcher*, 44(7), 371-386. Slee, R., Tomlinson, S., & Weiner, G. (2003). *School effectiveness for whom?* London: Falmer. United Nations Educational,

Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015a). Global monitoring report 2015: Education for all 2000-2015: Achievements and challenges. Paris: Author. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002322/232205e.pdf>

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015b). Incheon declaration and framework for action for the implementation of sustainable development goal 4. Paris: Author. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002456/245656e.pdf>

Optimizing the educational subject between testing and inclusion in an era of neoliberalism: Musings on a research agenda and its future perspectives

Allan, J. (2005). Inclusion as an ethical project. In S. Tremain (Ed.), *Foucault and the government of disability*. Detroit, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 281-297.

Arendt, H. (2006). The crisis in education. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Between past and future*. London: Penguin Books (originally published in 1958), pp. 170-193.

Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 63-79.

Bürgi, R. (2015). *Geplante Bildung für die freie Welt: Die OECD und die Entstehung einer technokratischen Bildungsexpertise*. Ph.D Dissertation. University of Luxembourg.

Engsig, T. T., & Johnstone, C. J. (2015). Is there something rotten in the state of Denmark? The paradoxical policies of inclusive education - Lessons from Denmark. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(5), 469-486.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Pantheon Press.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hamre, B. (2012): *Potentialitet og optimering i skolen - [Potentiality and optimization in school]*. Ph.D thesis. Institut for Uddannelse og Pædagogik. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitet.

Hamre, B. (2014). Optimization as a dispositive in the production of differences in schools in Denmark. *European Education*, 45(4), 1, 7-25.

Harwood, V., & Allan, J. (2014). *Psychopathology at school: Theorizing mental disorders in education*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.

Korsgaard, M. T. (2017). *Bearing with strangers - Education*

and the politics of inclusion. Ph.D thesis. Institut for Uddannelse og Pædagogik. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus Universitet.

Kousholt, K. (2016). Testing as social practice - Analysing testing in classes of young children from the children's perspective. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(3), 377-392.

Kousholt, K., & Hamre, B. (2016). Testing and school reform in Danish education: An analysis informed by the use of 'the dispositive'. In W. C. Smith (Ed.), *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books, Oxford Studies in Comparative Education.

Lyons, R. (1964). The OECD Mediterranean regional project. *The American Economist*, 8(2), 11-22.

Masschelein, J., & Simons, M. (2015). Education in times of fast learning: The future of the school. *Ethics and Education*, 10(1), 84-95. Morin, A. (2015). Children's conduct of life - Across general school, educational psychology consultation and psychiatry. *Nordic Psychology*, 67(3), 225-240. Nissen, M., Keis, M. K. B., & Nielsen, A. N. (2016). User-driven standards in a mutual help context: The co-emergence of subjects and standards. *Theory & Psychology*, 26(2), 243-262. Organisation for European Economic Cooperation. (1960). *Forecasting manpower needs for the age of science*. Paris: OEEC Publications. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1961). *Policy conference on economic growth and investment in education*. Washington 16th-20th October 1961 . Paris: OECD Publishing. Reese, W. J. (2013). *Testing wars in the public schools: A forgotten history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Smith, W. C. (Ed.). (2016). *The global testing culture: Shaping education policy, perceptions, and practice*. Oxford: Symposium Books. Ydesen, C. (2011). *The rise of high-stakes educational testing in Denmark, 1920-1970*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.